

AN
ANSWER
TO A
DISCOURSE

INTITULED,

Papists *Protesting against Protestant - Popery :*

Being a **VINDICATION** of

Papists not Mis-represented by Protestants :

And Containing

A Particular Examination of Monsieur de *MEAUX*,

Late Bishop of *Condom*, his Exposition of the

Doctrine of the **CHURCH** of

ROME, in the Articles

OF

INVOCATION of SAINTS,

And the Worship of Images,

Occasioned by that Discourse.

The Second Edition.

LONDON:

Printed for *John Amery* at the *Peacock*, and *William Rogers* at the *Sun*, both against *St. Dunstan's* Church in *Fleetstreet*. MDCLXXXVIII.

(17)

THE APOLOGY of the Church of *England*; And
an Epistle to one Signior *Scipio*, a *Venetian* Gen-
tleman, concerning the Council of *Trent*. VVritten
both in Latin, by the Right Reverend Father in God,
JOHN JEWEL Lord Bishop of *Sarisbury*. Made English
by a Person of Quality. To which is added, The Life
of the said Bishop; Collected and Written by the same
Hand.

Printed for *Richard Chiswell* at the *Rose and Crown* in *St. Pauls*
Church-Yard. 1685.



AN
ANSWER
TO
Papists Protesting
AGAINST
Protestant Popery.

Imprimatur,

*C. Alston, R. P. D. Hen. Episc.
Lond. à Sacris Domest.*

Martii 29.
1686.



3

AN
ANSWER
TO A
DISCOURSE

INTITULED,

Papists *Protesting* against Protestant Popery :

Being a VINDICATION of

Papists not Mis-represented by Protestants :

And Containing

A Particular Examination of Monsieur de MEAUX,

Late Bishop of Condom, his Exposition of the

Doctrine of the CHURCH of

ROME, in the Articles

OF

INVOCATION of SAINTS,

And the Worship of Images,

Occasioned by that Discourse.

The Second Edition.

LONDON:

Printed for John Amery at the Peacock, and William
Rogers at the Sun, both against St. Dunstan's
Church in Fleetstreet. MDCLXXXVIII.

A. N. S. W. E. R.



THE BRITISH MUSEUM, LONDON.

A N
A N S W E R
T O
Papists Protesting
A G A I N S T
Protestant Popery.

SINCE the Protestor thinks my Answer to his Reflections so great a Complement, I am resolv'd to oblige him a little farther, and to complement him very heartily, and I see no reason, but Complementing may be as good a word for Disputing, as Representing is.

The Reply consisted of two parts, 1. Concerning the Misrepresentation of a Papist. 2. Concerning the Rule of true Representing, and I shall consider, what the Protesting Papist says to each of them.

As for the First, a Misrepresenter is so foul a Character, that no man can wonder, if we think our selves concern'd to wipe off such an imputation: and therefore I expressly denied the charge, and made it appear from comparing his own Characters of a Papist Mis-represented, and Represented together, that we had not charged them falsely in any matter of Fact, and therefore are no Mis-representers: for if we charge them with believing and doing nothing, but
what

what they themselves confess to be their Faith and Practice, wherein is the Misrepresentation? Thus I particularly showed, that all matters of Fact (excepting some points, wherein they disown the Doctrine of their own Church) in the Character of the Papist Misrepresented, are confessed and defended in the Character of the Papist Represented; and the Protester himself acknowledges, that *I have learnedly* (as he is pleased to speak) *distinguished between matters of Dispute, and of Representation*; and if so, then he ought to own, that we do not Mis-represent them: and this is all I undertook to prove in the first part of my Reply, and for that reason gave it the Title of, *A Papist not Mis-represented by Protestants*, wholly with relation to his Character of a Papist Misrepresented, which I had proved to contain nothing in it, which in a strict and proper sense can be called a Mis-representation. We truly relate what the Faith and Practice of the Church of Rome is, and this is true Representing; and though we say their Faith is erroneous, and their Practices corrupt or superstitious, contrary to the Laws of God, and the usages of the Primitive Church; yet whether this be true or false, it is no matter of Representation but Dispute; though we believe thus of their Faith and Practice, we do not charge them with believing so, and therefore do not Mis-represent a Papist. Whether they or we be in the right, is matter of Dispute, and not to be determined by Character-making, but by an appeal to the Laws of God, and the dictates of right Reason, and the Authentick Records of the ancient Church. While we agree about matter of Fact, there can be no Mis-representing on either side, for there is a great deal of difference between a Mis-representation, and a false Judgment of things; and thus I hoped, the talk of Mis-representing would have been at an end.

But our Author, though he confesses I am in the right, will have us to be Mis-representers still; He says, *I declare plainly, that Popery is really that Antichristian Religion, which Protestants say it is, that it teaches and practises all those sopperies, superstitions and nonsense, which have at any time been charged against it by Protestants.* But I never said any such thing yet, but only said and proved, that all matters of Fact complained of in the

the Character of a Papist Misrepresented, are owned by himself in the Character of a Papist Represented; and this, I thought, was proof enough, that we were no Mis-representers. But the Title of my Reply offends him, *A Papist not Mis-represented by Protestants*, which he says, is a condemnation of the Religion to all those horrid shapes and monstrous forms, it has been at any time exposed in, by Members of the Reformation; by no means! If there have been other Mis-representations of them, which our Author has not yet given us an account of, I can say nothing to them, till I see what they are; but my Title related only to my Book, and that related only to the Character of a Papist Mis-represented, which our Author had given us, and I undertook for that then, and will defend it still, that there is no Mis-representation in it.

Of the same nature is what he adds, *That I tell my Reader in the name of all my Brethren, we charge them (the Papists) with nothing, but what they expressly profess to believe, and what they practise*; and thus says the Protector, *in this one assertion vouches for the truth of all that infamy, and prophaneness, which is laid at their doors*: and thus, for ought I see, I am drawn in for a great deal more than I intended; I spoke with reference to his Characters, and now I must discharge the scores of all Protestants since the beginning of the Reformation; but when a Man's in, he must get out as well as he can: but would not one wonder, that there should not be one word of his own Mis-representations, which he has so unjustly father'd upon us, he should be hunting about to pick up some new Mis-representations for me to answer? There must be a reason for this, and I believe, I can guess what it is.

But however he takes this occasion to ransack the Writings of Protestants, and to see what fine things they have said of Papists, and to collect a new Character of a Papist Mis-represented out of them. *For since all that proceeds from a Papish hand of this nature is suspected and challenged, and the double Character of a Papist Mis-represented and Represented (about which, as the Replier says, there is so much pother and noise) is questioned as to its method, its sincerity, and exactness, we'll now follow our Author's call, and learn what Popery is, from the Pens of Protestants,*

stants, and especially from some of those, who are supposed to know what Popery is. And thus our Author makes as many turnings and doublings as ever any poor Hare did, which was almost run down. Because I have proved, that his Character of a Papist Mis-represented, contains no Mis-representation in it, properly so called, therefore forsooth we will not take Characters from a Papist, because we confute them, as soon as they make them, which is not very civil; and therefore hoping that we will be more civil to Protestant Characters, he turns off the Dispute to them; never did any Man take more pains to defend Popery, than he does to prove a Papist to be Mis-represented; it seems there is something in the World called Popery, which he is very much ashamed of, and it is well if it does not prove to be his own beloved Popery at last.

I had told him as plainly as I could in Answer to his Character of a Papist Mis-represented, what I called Popery, and what I take to be the general sense of Protestants about it, and shewed him evidently, that what he calls a Mis-representation is none; nay, in most cases I have allow'd his own Character of a Papist Represented, and surely there is no Mis-representation in that, unless he has mis-represented a Papist himself; and why is he not satisfied with this; why so much Zeal to prove us Mis-representers, when we are willing to fall with the Market, and to abate as much in the Notion and Idea of Popery, as they are pleased to lower it? Why must we be bound to justify that Representation of Popery, which some Protestants have formerly made of it, when Popery was quite another thing, than the Bishop of *Condom*, and the Representers have now made it, any more than they are bound to justify every thing, which *Thomas Aquinas*, or *Bellarmin*, or *Vasquez* have taught for Popery.

But let us consider that Character, he has made of a Papist out of the Writings of Protestants, only I must put him in mind, that he must still distinguish between matters of Representation and Dispute. If the matter of Fact they charge them with be true, they are no Mis-representers; as for their Reasons and Arguments, I will no more undertake to defend all the reasonings of Protestants,

testants, than I suppose, our Protester will all the reasonings of Papists.

The first Mis-representer he brings upon the Stage, is *John* Lord Archbishop of *York*, in his Manual or three small and plain Treatises, written for the use of a Lady, to preserve her from the danger of Popery. And all that I shall say to this, is, that if what he transcribes out of his Book, be a Mis-representation, it is not a Protestant, but a Popish Mis-representation. For the Archbishop cites his Authors for what he says, as the very Title of the Chapter tells us, which I shall here present to the Reader, with all the References and Authorities as they are Printed in his Book, and leave the Protester to consider of a good Reason, why he left all these Authorities out.

CHAP. VI.

Reasons of Refusal to leave the Romish Religion, Collected out of Printed Authors.

I cannot leave my Religion.

Pap.

I. REASON.

BECAUSE we must simply believe the Church of *Rome*, whether it teach true or false, *Staph. Antidot in Evang. Luk. 10. 16. page 528.*

And if the Pope believe there is *no life to come*, we must believe it as an Article of our Faith. *Bulgradus.*

And we must not hear *Protestant* Preachers, though they Preach the *Truth. Rhem. upon Tit. 3. 10.* And for your Scripture, we little weigh it. For the Word of God, if it be not expounded as the Church of *Rome* will have it, is the word of the Devil. *Hosias de expresso verbo Dei.*

B

II. REA-

II. REASON.

You rely too much upon the *Gospel*, and St. *Paul's* Epistles in your Religion ; whereas, the Gospel is but a Fable of Christ, as Pope *Leo* the tenth tells us. *Apol. of H. Stephen fol. 358. Smeton. contra Hamilton, pag. 104.*

And the Pope can dispense against the *New Testament*. *Pa-normis. extra de divoritiis.*

And he may check, when he pleases, the Epistles of St. *Paul*. *Carolus Ruinus Concil. 109. Num. 1. Volum. 5.*

And controul any thing avouched by all the Apostles. *Rota in decis. 1. Num. 3. in noviss. Anton. Maria in addit. ad decis. Rotæ nov. de Big. n. 10.* And there is an eternal Gospel, to wit, that of the *Holy Ghost*, which puts down *Christ's*. *Cirellus a Carmelite* set it forth.

III. REASON.

You attribute all your Salvation to *Faith* in Christ alone. Whereas, he is the Saviour of *Men* only, but of no *Women*, *Dial. of Dives and Pauper, compl. 6. cited by Rogers upon the Artic. and Postellus in Jesuits Catech. L. 1. Cap. 10.*

For Women are saved by	{	S. Clare.	{	Som. in Morn. de Eccles. Cap. 9.
		Mother Jane.		Postellus in Jesu- its Catech. Lib. 8. Cap. 10.

Nay to speak properly, St. *Francis* hath redeemed as many as are saved since his days. *Conformis. of St. Fran.*

And the Blood of St. *Thomas à Becket*. *Hor. Beat. Virg.*

And sometimes one man, by his satisfactions, redeems another. *Test. Rhem. in Rom. 8. 17.*

IV. REA-

IV. REASON.

In your Church there is but one way to Remission of Sins, which you call Faith in Christ ; but we have many. For we put away

Our	{	Venials, with a little Holy Water, <i>Test. Rbem. in Rom. 8. 17.</i>
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Merits of the B. Virg. <i>Hor. B. Virg.</i> 2. The Blood of <i>Becket, Ib.</i> 3. <i>Agnos Dei</i>, or Holy Lambs, <i>Cerem. L. 1. T. 7.</i>
	{	Mortals, by
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Little parcels of the Gospel, <i>Breviar.</i> 5. Becoming <i>Franciscans</i>, <i>Conf. l. 1. Fol. 101</i> 6. A Bishop's Pardon for 40 days, a Cardinal's for an 100 days, and the Pope's for ever.
		<i>Taxa Camer. apud. Eß. in 1 ad Tim.</i>

V. REASON.

You stand too precisely upon your *Sacraments*, and require a true *Faith*, in the partakers. Whereas with us, to become a *Monk*, or a *Nun*, is as good as the *Sacrament of Baptism*, *Aquin. de Ingres. Relig. L. 2. C. 21.*

And the very true and real *Body of Christ* may be devoured of Dogs, Hogs, Cats and Rats, *Alex. Hales, part. 4. q. 45. Thom. parte 3. q. 8. art. 3.*

VI. REASON.

Then for your Ministers, every one is allowed to have his *Wife*; or else inforced to live *chastly*: whereas with us, the Pope himself cannot dispense with a Priest to *marry*, no more than he can privilege him to take a *Purse*. *Turrianus* found fault wihal by *Cassan. consult. art. 23.*

But Whoredom is allowed all the year long. See *Sparks's Discovery*, page 13. and *constitut. Orben. de concubis. Claric. remouend.*

And another Sin for *June, July, August*, which you must not know of: *Allowed for this time by Sixtus Quartus to all the Family of the Cardinal of St. Lucie. Vessel. Grovingens. tract. de indulgent. citat. à Jacob. Laurent. Jésuit. Lib. Pag. 196. vide Jo. Wolfii Lektion. memorab. centen. 15. page 836.*

For indeed the wickedness of the Church-men is a prime Argument of the worthiness of the *Roman Church*. *Bellar. L. 4. de Rom. Pont. Cap. 14. Artic. 28.*

And the Pope can make that *righteous*, which is *unrighteous*, *L. 1. Decretal. Greg. Tit. 7. C. 5.*

And yet can no man say unto him, Sir, Why do you so? *In extrav. Tom. 22. Titul. 5. C. ad Apostolatus.*

VII. And last REASON.

You in the Church of *England* have cast off the Bishop of *Rome*, whereas the Bishop of *Rome* is a God. *Dist. 96. c. satis evidenter, & Panorm. cap. Quanto Abbas.*

The Use and Application of this Doctrine you may find in the next Chapter, and a particular proof that some Doctrines of the *Roman Church* destroy justice towards men in all relations; as the Pope's power of dispensing with the duties of all relations: their Doctrines of Probabilities, of Mental Reservations, that the Intention regulates the Action, that no Faith is to be kept with Hereticks, that the Pope may depose Princes, and dispose of their Kingdoms, Pardon, nay Canonize King-killers, and absolve Subjects from their Allegiance, &c.

I know our Author calls all this Misrepresentation, but that is not our Dispute now; but whose Misrepresentation it is. It is plain, this is not Protestant but Popish Popery; for not Protestants, but Papists, were the Original Authors: And I doubt not, were it worth the while, it might easily be proved, that the grossest Misrepresentations, which this Author charges on Protestants, are only transcribed out of Popish Authors; and this he seems to own, when he is so angry with us for proving these Misrepresentations, as he calls them, by appealing to their own private, but approved Doctors, who have in plain terms asserted those things, which poor Protestants must not repeat after them, without incurring the Censure of Misrepresenters. Now

Now though we grant, that every Doctrine, which we find in Popish Authors, ought not to be accounted an Article of the Romish Faith, yet if such Books be published by the Authority of Superiors, and when they are published and known in the World, escape the Inquisition and the *Index expurgatorius*, the Doctrines contained in them, ought at least to be looked on, as licensed and tolerated Doctrines, and therefore consistent with the Romish Faith, not a Misrepresentation of it. For will a Church so strict and severe in its Discipline, and so jealous of Heresies, which censures all the Ancient Fathers, and expunges out of their Writings every passage, which in the least favours of Heresie; which will not entrust the People to use the Bible for fear of their learning Heresie from it; I say, will such a Church suffer their own Doctors to publish such Opinions to the World, as Misrepresent her own Faith and Worship, without condemning, or passing the least censure on them?

And therefore though we cannot prove from these private Doctors, what the Faith of the Church of *Rome* is, and what all are bound to believe, who are of that Communion, yet by their Authority we may confute the charge of Misrepresentation. For no Protestant can be justly accused of Misrepresenting the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, who charges them with no Doctrines, but what are allowed to be taught in that Church, as all those Doctrines are, which are allowed by publick Authority to be Printed and Read in the Communion of that Church, especially, as I observed before, where the Press is kept under such strict Discipline, as it is in the Church of *Rome*.

We must not indeed charge all Papists with believing such Doctrines, because all are not bound to believe them, as they are to believe the Decrees and Definitions of their Councils; but we may say, that they are not contrary to the Faith of the Church, because all Papists are allowed to believe them, who will; for I presume all Men are allowed to believe that, which any Man among them is allowed to teach.

However I hope, it may be some excuse to the Archbishop, that he Misrepresents only at second hand, (since

our Author will have it to be a Misrepresentation) and says no more than some Papists themselves say, and resolves all into the Credit and Authority of his Authors ; And I cannot think it a greater fault in a Protestant to give an account of such pernicious Doctrines and Opinions, as are owned by some of their own Writers, than it is in the Church of *Rome* to suffer them to be published by Authority, and to pass without any Censure, if they dislike the Doctrine.

As for what he transcribes out of Doctor *Beard* and Mr. *Sutcliff*, I presume, he intended we should take it all upon his Authority ; for he has not directed us where to find any of those passages he has cited, and it is a little too much to read two great Books in Quarto to pick them out. Without looking on the Books we might easily perceive, that those sayings he has transcribed out of them, do not concern Representing, but Disputing, and I never undertook to justify every saying in Protestant Writers against Popery ; but yet some things sounded so harsh, that I vehemently suspected foul play, and therefore had the curiosity to examine, and found it to be, as I suspected. Some passages for which they produce their Authorities, and that very good Authorities, as the World went then, are cited by the Protester, without any Authorities, as he dealt before with the Archbishop ; or what they prove by variety of reasons, is nakedly Represented without any reason to back it ; or their words are curtailed, or transplaced, which alters their sense and signification. I shall give some few instances of this out of Mr. *Sutcliff*, to let the World judge, who are the Misrepresenters.

*Quotations out of Mr. Sutcliff in the
Papist Protesting, &c.*

Mr. Sutcliff's Survey of Popery.

P. 12. **T**hey speak what
they can in disgrace
of the Holy Scriptures.

Finally they say, they are obscure
and hard to be understood,
*they speak what they can in disgrace of
the Holy Scriptures. P. 6.*

They give the Office of Christ's
mediation to the Virgin *Mary*, to

They give the Office, &c. teaching
that by their Merits Christians ob-
tain

Angels and to Saints, they make also Saints our Redeemers.

They overthrow Grace, and ascribe the merit of our Salvation not to God's mercy through Christ, not to the merit of his Passion, but properly to our own Works and Merits.

They cut out the Second Commandment, because it cannot stand with the Popish Worship of Images.

They pray before Stocks and Stones, nay they put their trust in them.

Papists think they do God good Service, when they murder true Christians.

By the Doctrine of Papists the Devils may be saved.

Papists blasphemously make Christ not only a desperate man without Hope, but also an Infidel without Faith. P. 13.

That Christ is not the Redeemer of all Mankind.

tain their desires, and are delivered out of Purgatory. *Ibid.*

Albeit they exclude not Grace from the work of our Salvation, yet making Grace a Habit or Vertue, *they overthrow Grace, &c.*

They cut out the Second Commandment in the Offices of our Lady and their Primers, because, &c. lb.

Nay they put their trust in them : for if this were not so, why should they hope for better success at the Image of our Lady of Loretto, or Monserat, than at any other Image or Form of our Lady ? p. 10.

Proved from the cruel Executions in England, France, Germany, Spain. p. 23.

They teach, that the Devils of Hell may have true Faith, but our Saviour saith *John 3. that whosoever believeth in him shall not perish, but have everlasting life.* So it followeth by the Doctrine of Papists, that the Reprobates, and Devils in Hell may be saved. p. 28.

They take from Christ both Faith and Hope. *Aqui. p. 3. q. 7. art. 4.* So that which they falsely objected to Calvin doth rightly fall upon the Papists---*that they blasphemously make Christ, &c.*

They affirm the Virgin Mary to be conceived without original Sin, &c. of which it follows, that *Christ is not the Redeemer of all Mankind*, for what needed they a Redeemer, who were not born Sinners ? p. 41.

They

They make Christ inferiour to Saints and Angels.

They say Masses in honour of Angels and Saints, but he, in whose honour a Sacrifice is offered, is greater than the Sacrifice: doth it not then appear, that while they offer Christ's Body and Blood in honour of Saints and Angels, *they make Christ inferior to Saints and Angels?* p. 42.

They prefer the Pope before Christ.

They prefer the Pope before Christ, for Christ's Body, when the Pope goeth in progress, is sent before with the Baggage, and when the Pope is near, goeth out to meet him, while all the Gallants of Rome attend on the Pope, p. 43.

To the Images of the Cross and Crucifix, they give as much honour as is due to God. p. 14.

To the Images, &c.—teaching their followers, that it is but one honour given to the Image, and the thing Represented by the Image. p. 74.

They fall down like Beasts before the Pope, and worship him as God, ascribing to him most blasphemously the honour due to Christ.

They fall down, &c. *Paulus Emilius* l. 2. telleth, how the Ambassadors of *Sicily* cried thus to the Pope, Thou that takest away the sins of the World have mercy upon us.—*Stapleton* to *Greg.* 13: calls him *Supremum numen in terris*: They call him Vicar of Christ, the Monarch of the Church, the Head, the Spouse, the Foundation of the Church, *ascribing to him most blasphemously the honour due to Christ.* p. 72.

They give divine honour to Images, which they themselves cannot deny to be Idolatrous.

They confess it Idolatry to give divine honour to Creatures. But they give divine honour to the Sacrament, to the Cross, and to Images of the Trinity, which, I hope, they will not deny to be Creatures.

The Romish Church consists of
a Pack of Infidels. p. 15.

Faith is of things (as the Papists say in their Catechism) only proposed to us by the Church; so that if the Church propose not to us the Articles of Faith, we are not to believe them, if these men teach truth. Further this sheweth, the *Romish Church consists of a pack of Infidels*; for if the same believed not without the authority of the Church, then she did believe nothing of Christ, seeing the Papists acknowledge no other Church but that of *Rome*, and no Church can teach it self. p. 178.

Scripture and Fathers they read not.

Spoken of the Schoolmen (not of all Papists) upon the authority of *Ferdinando Vellofello*. p. 200.

In a member of the Catholick Church (they say) neither inward Faith nor other Virtue is required, but only that he profess outwardly the Romish Religion, and be subject to the Pope.

This Opinion he attributes to Cardinal *Bellarmin*, and cites *de Eccles. milit. cap. 2*.

They make more Conscience to abstain from Flesh on *Friday*, than to murder Christians.

They make more Conscience, &c. as their curiosity in keeping the Fast, and their Cruelty in massacring Christians declares. p. 205.

Divers points of Popish Doctrine are especially said to proceed from the Devil.

He instances in forbidding Marriage, and commanding to abstain from Meats, which he says are called in Scripture, Doctrines of Devils. p. 213.

That the Popish Church hath no true Bishops: That Popery in many points is more absurd and abominable than the Doctrine of Mahomet: That Papists, that positively hold the heretical and false Doctrines of the Modern Church of Rome, cannot possibly be saved: Are the Titles of several Chapters, in which he endeavours to make good these charges, how well let our Author consider; but all men will see, that this is not Representing but Disputing.

This is abundantly enough to give the Reader a taste of the Protester's honesty in Representing, and how little I am concerned in these Quotations. If some Protestants have charged the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome* with such consequences as they cannot justify, wiser Protestants disown it, and Papists may confute it, if they please, which will be a little more to the purpose, than to cry out so Tragically about Mis-representing.

But to make good this charge of Mis-representing against us, he concludes with several passages out of the Homilies, concerning the Worship of Saints and Images. Now if our Church be guilty of Mis-representing in her very Homilies, which we are all bound to subscribe, we must acknowledge our selves to be Mis-representers. But wherein does the Mis-representation consist? Do they not set up Images in Churches? And do they not Worship them? Have they not a great number of Saints, whom they Worship with Divine Honours? The matter of fact is plain and confessed, and therefore our Church does not Mis-represent them. So that the only Mis-representation he can complain of, is, that he does not like the judgment of our Church about the Worship of Saints and Images, and we cannot help that. This is the belief of our Church, and this is our belief, and let him prove us to be Mis-representers in this, if he can; for that is not proved merely by his calling it Mis-representing.

Only I would gladly know of this Author, what he takes the judgment of the Church of *England* to be about the Worship of Images? Whether it be Idolatry or not? If he thinks our Church charges them with Idolatry in Worshipping Images, (which I suppose he means when he complains of Mis-representation, and picks out some passages, which look that way) there is the authority of Doctor *Godden* against him (unless he has changed his mind lately) who accuses Dr. *St.* with contradicting the Church of *England* in his charge of Idolatry upon the Church of *Rome*, and makes it a certain mark of Fanaticism to do so: and then however we may be thought to Mis-represent the Church of *Rome* in this charge of Idolatry, we do not Mis-represent the Church of *England* in it, which is some satisfaction to us, that we are not Mis-representers on both sides. But these men take great liberties in Representing the Faith and Doctrines of Churches. In one King's Reign the Church of *England* does not charge the Church of *Rome* with Idolatry, in the next it does; though their Articles and Homilies be the same still: but they deal with the Church of *England* no worse than they do with their own Church; in one Age a *Bellarmino* truly Represents the Doctrine of their Church, in another a Bishop of *Condom*; and though the Council of *Trent* be but one

one and the same, the Faith of it alters very often, as it may best serve the Interest of the Catholick Cause.

Our Author having exposed the Protestant Character (as he calls it) of a Papist, which he always looked upon no other, than of a Papist Mis-represented, he falls a commending the zeal of Protestants against such Popery with great earnestness and passion, and therein we agree with him, as believing it to be very commendable; and do not doubt (as he says) but those Martyrs Recorded by Fox, who for not embracing this Popery passed the fiery Tryal, had surely a glorious Cause, and that the Triumphs and Crowns of Glory, which waited for them in Heaven, were not inferior to what those enjoyed, who suffered under Decius or Dioclesian. I agree with him also, that there is no need of any longer disagreement, that there is no necessity of keeping up Names of Division; that Protestant and Papist may now shake hands, and by one subscription close into a Body, and joyn in a fair and amicable correspondence: For if (as he says) there is no Papist, but will give his hand for the utter suppressing this kind of Popery, I see no reason, why they may not joyn in Communion with the Church of England which has suppressed it. But I am not of his mind, that all the strife has been about a word; for the Dispute has been about the Worship of Saints, and Images, about Transubstantiation, worshipping the Host, Communion in one kind, Service in an unknown Tongue, the authority and the use of the Holy Scriptures, the Sacrament of Penance, Indulgences, Purgatory, the Pope's Supremacy, and several other material differences; which are something more than a meer Word; Will they now part with all these Doctrines and Practices, since they have been informed by great and good authorities, what the nature and evil tendency of these things is? No! by no means, they will retain all these Doctrines and Practices still, but will renounce and abhor all that evil, which Protestants charge them with. They will pray to Saints, and worship Images still, but they will abhor all Heathenish Idolatry in such Worship, &c. but what reason is this for Protestants to joyn with them in one Communion, while they retain the same Faith and Worship, which at first made a separation necessary, and we retain the same opinion of their Faith and Worship, which ever we had? If Papists be the same, and Protestants the same, that ever they were, if separation were

Papists Protestantizing, &c. p. 17.

p. 18.

once necessary, surely it is so still. What change is then now in Papists, which was not before, that should now invite us to embrace their Communion? Yes they abhor all that which Protestants call Popery. This is good news, but let us a little better understand it. Do they abhor the Worship of Saints and Images, and the Host? Do they abhor the Doctrines of Transubstantiation, Penances, Indulgences, Purgatory? Do they renounce the Pope's Supremacy, &c. no such matter! but they abhor those Opinions, which Protestants have of these things; Did they then ever believe that these Doctrines and Practices were so bad, as Protestants always did, and to this day, say they are? if not, what change is there in them, that should invite us now to a reconciliation? Did Protestants separate from Papists, because they believed, that Papists thought Idolatry lawful? If not, Why is their abhorring Idolatry, while they do the same things, that ever they did, a sufficient reason for a re-union? Suppose some Common-wealths-men, who take up Arms against the King, should tell the Royalists, who fight for him, That they have all this while mistaken one another, that for their parts they hate Rebellion, as much as they can do, and have been greatly Mis-represented by those who have called them Rebels; *the strife has been only about a Word*, and therefore it is time for them now to joyn all together, not in their duty to their Prince, but in opposing him; though I dare not smile at our Author for fear of his displeasure again, yet I fancy a good Subject would entertain such a proposal with a very disdainful smile.

And therefore as for Mis-representing, our Author may complain on till he is aweary, but he can never prove us to be Mis-representers, while they still own that Faith and Worship, which we charged them with, and if he thinks we censure their Doctrine and Worship too severely, let him vindicate it, when he can.

In my Reply I considered, what were the faults of his two-fold Character of *A Papist Mis-represented, and Represented*, and shall now briefly examine, what he says to it.

As for the Character of a Papist Mis-represented, I observed, 1. *That he put such things into the Character, as no man in his Wits ever charged them with: As that Papists are not permitted*

to bear Sermons, which they are able to understand, or that they held it lawful to commit Idolatry; or that the Papist believes the Pope to be his great God, and to be far above all Angels, which the Answerer calls Childish and wilful mistakes. And yet (says the Protester, p. 19.) those very things almost in express terms, and others far more absurd, we see charged on them, as is shewed above; that is in the Quotations out of the Archbishop and others. But I can see no such thing, unless the *Supremum numen in terris* (as Stapleton calls Greg. 13.) signifie that the Pope is their great God, and then I must beg his pardon, that I did not think any man in his wits so silly, as it seems some of their own great Divines have been, for this is not a Protestant, but a Popish representation of them.

2. I found fault, *That the Opinions of Protestants concerning Popish Doctrines and Practices, and those ill consequents which are charged and justly charged upon them, are put into the Character of a Papist mis-represented, as if they were his avowed Doctrine and Belief.* For whosoever gives a Character of a Papist, ought only to represent, what his Faith and Practice is, not what Opinion, he, who gives the Character, has of his Faith and Practice: for this does not belong to the Character of a Papist, but only signifies his own private Judgment, who gives the Character: while we charge Papists only with matter of Fact; what they believe and what they practice, this is a true Character, and no Mis-representing; but if we put our own Opinions of his Faith and Practice into his Character, this is Mis-representing, because a Papist has not the same Opinion of these things, which we have, and this makes it a false Character.

To this the Protester answers, p. 20. *This is a pretty speculative quarrel, I confess, and might deservedly find room here, were it our business to consider the due method of Mis-representation in the abstract: But as our present concern stands, here's a quaint conceit lost for coming in a wrong place. For what had the Author of the Mis-representation to do with these Rules? He did not intend to mis-represent any Body.* This is very pleasant! a Man, who undertakes to make Characters, is not bound to consider what a Character is, nor what belongs to representing, nor mis-representing. Any Man would have thought so indeed, who had read his Characters, but I never expected that he should have said so. But he did not intend to mis-represent any Body, and therefore had nothing to do with those Rules; but he intended, it seems, to give an account, how Papists are mis-represented by Protestants, and therefore ought to have understood, what is Mis-representing, and not have called that Mis-representing, which is not.

But his Province (he says) was only to draw forth the Character of a Papist, as it is commonly apprehended by the Vulgar, or the Multitude, with the common prejudices and mistakes that generally attend such a notion. Now I would fain know, whether this Character, as it lies in the Peoples heads, is distinguished into antecedents and consequents; whether they, when they hear one declaiming against Popery for committing Idolatry, as bad or worse than that of the grossest Heathens, worshipping Stocks and Stones for Gods, distinguish between the Doctrine of the Papists, and these interpretations and consequences charged against it.

P. 23.

— Thus in short he tells us, The Character of a Papist Mis-represented was intended only, as the Author expresses himself in his introduction, for a Copy of Popery as painted in the imagination of the Vulgar, and if it be conform to that, it is exact and perfect; and if there be any faults in it, the blame must fall on those who drew the Original. This is the sum of his excuse for putting such things into the Character of a Papist Mis-represented, as do not belong to Character-making, nor are in a strict and proper sense Mis-representations. That the common People, who do not distinguish between Antecedents and Consequents, have such an idea and notion of a Papist, as he has described in the Character of a Papist Mis-represented. Well, suppose this, how does this mend the matter? If his Character of a Papist Mis-represented, be no Mis-representation, then our People, who have this notion of a Papist, are not Mis-representers. Now this is that, which I undertook to prove in my Reply, That there is nothing of Mis-representation, properly so called, in his Character of a Papist Mis-represented; It is a false Character indeed, because it contains such things, as are not matters of Representation, but of Dispute, and therefore do not belong to a Character; but separate matters of Fact from matters of Opinion and Dispute, as I have particularly done in my Reply, and the Character of a Papist Mis-represented contains no matter of Fact, excepting some very few things, but what the Character of the Papist Represented owns. And therefore as far as it can be called a Character, it is a true one. And if this (as he says) be a Copy of Popery as painted in the imagination of the Vulgar, the Original can have no more of Mis-representation in it, than the Copy has.

P. 21.

But though the Protester does acknowledge, that there is a real difference between Representing the Doctrines and Practices of Papists, and declaring our own Judgment and Opinion concerning them, he suspects the People do not distinguish between Antecedents and Consequents, between the Doctrines of the Papists and these Interpretations and Consequences charged on it.

They

They swallow all down greedily in the lump, Antecedents and Consequents go down with them all at once. But what does he mean by this? that any Protestant People are so silly as to think that Papists believe as bad of their own Religion, as they believe of it? That Papists believe Idolatry to be lawful, as he tells us in the Character of a Papist Mis-represented; or that they believe the Worship of an Image to be Idolatry? No, I assure him, our People are taught, what Popery is in its genuine purity, as he speaks; they know in the most material points, what the Doctrine of the Church of Rome is, and are taught, what to think of it; and when they hear or read our Disputes against the Church of Rome, they are not so weak as to believe, that we and Papists have the same Opinions about Worshipping Saints and Images, and the Host, &c. and therefore are not in danger of affixing such Opinions on Papists, as they hear us charge on Popery. So that this is a very needless fear he is in, and if nothing else hinders, he may (as he promises) reform his Character of a Papist Mis-represented.

I must confess we are pretty positive in declaring to our People the evil and danger of Popery. We tell them what we think of it, not as *thinking* signifies doubtfulness and uncertainty, but an assured persuasion founded on Reason, Scripture, and the best Authorities: as he complains, *that we go beyond thinking, and instead of saying, we think so, we positively say, so it is.* But if we are in the right, there is no hurt in this, and we shall believe so, till they can prove, that we are in the wrong; we do not indeed pretend to Infallibility, but we think our selves as certain, as those who do.

This is the sum of what he says in defence of his Character of a Papist Mis-represented, that though he acknowledges my distinction to be good between Matters of Dispute, and of Representation; and consequently that his Character of a Papist Mis-represented has nothing of Mis-representation in it, truly so called; yet he says, this is the Idea of a Papist, as it is commonly apprehended by the Vulgar, who do not distinguish between Antecedents and Consequents, but whatever they hear said of Popery, they take to be the Faith of a Papist, without distinguishing what it is the Papists own, and believe, and practise, and what guilt Protestants charge them with, for thus believing and doing: that when they hear the Papists charged with Idolatry for Worshipping Images, they as verily think, that Papists believe Idolatry to be lawful, as they

they do, that they believe it lawful to Worship Images. If there be any among us so very silly, I dare say, they can neither Read nor Write, and therefore he might have spared his pains in writing and printing Characters for them; and if his Character of a Papist (as he says) be what he thought of a Papist, while he himself was a Protestant, it seems he was in a very low dispensation then, and could not himself *distinguish between Antecedents and Consequents, but swallowed all down together*, though he is now improved into a Writer of Characters; and may they never have any wiser Converts. However this does plainly yield the cause, that the Protestant Clergy, and understanding Gentry and Laity, who can distinguish between Antecedents and Consequents, are no Mis-representers; and as for others, we fear, they have a great many more Mis-representers on their side, than we hope, we have on ours.

Let us now consider his Character of a Papist Represented, and what the faults of that are. Now the general fault is, that whereas one might reasonably expect, that there should be some difference between the Character of a Papist Mis-represented, and of a Papist Represented, and he has endeavoured to make his Readers believe, that there is, yet in truth there is none in most parts of the Character. For what does strictly belong to Representation; that is, all matter of Fact, is the same in both. For, 1. He having put the Opinions of Protestants concerning Popish Doctrines and Practices into the Character of a Papist Mis-represented, as if they were his avowed Doctrine and Belief; *in the Character of a Papist Represented, he denies, that he believes those Interpretations and Consequences; and this he might very easily do, because (as he observes, p. 24.) no body charges him with that belief; and whereas he says, then he contradicts his Body, and he hopes there is no fault in that, he is so far in the right; but his fault is, that he imposes upon his Reader, with an appearance of a Mis-representation, when there is none; and by his denying that they believe such things, would persuade the World, that Protestants charge Papists with believing all these ill things themselves, which we say of their Faith and Worship; a sign that he was hard put to it, to find out some Protestant Mis-representations of Papists. And 2. As for matter of Fact, which alone is proper for a Character, he generally owns the Doctrines and Practices we charge them with; and his saying, how could this possibly be otherwise, if they charge us with none, but what we expressly*

expressly profess to own (in which he reflects upon what I had said in my Reply, that we charge them with believing nothing, but what they expressly profess to believe) is nothing to the purpose; for it is not absolutely *what we charge them with*, but what he himself makes us charge them with in his Character of a Papist Mis-represented, and calls us Mis-representers for doing so, that he owns in the Character of a Papist Represented, as I particularly shewed in my Reply; now the question is, Why he calls one Character a Mis-representation, and the other a Representation, when the matter of Fact is the same in both?

But then (3.) I observed, *that in some cases he disowns that to be the Doctrine and Belief of their Church, which manifestly is so, and has been proved on them, beyond all possibility of a fair Reply, by the learned Answerer.* To which he answers: *then for all his word, we are in some cases charged with more than we expressly profess to believe.* But he must know we do not take the profession of the Roman Faith from every private Character-maker, but from the Authentick Records of their Church; and if they deny what their Church teaches, and requires them to believe, it is not indeed their Faith, but yet it ought to be so: and though he may huff at *manifestly and proving*, I suspect, he will take a little time before he brings it to the Tryal.

This is a sufficient answer to his fresh complaint of Mis-representations. I now proceed to the second part of the Reply, the Rule of true Representing, or the Rule whereby the Doctrine of the Church of Rome is to be known. He appealed to the Council of *Trent*, and the Catechism *ad Parochos*, and these I acknowledged to be authentick Rules; but since Catholick Divines differ about the sense of the Council and Catechism, the question is, Why we must prefer his Sense of the Council and Catechism before Cardinal *Bellarmin's*, or any other Divines of Note and Eminency in the Church of *Rome*, who lived since the Council of *Trent*, and may be presumed to understand the meaning of it, as well as the Representers; and therefore to remove this difficulty in his Reflections, he appealed to the Bishop of *Coudom*, as the Authentick Expofitor of the Council and Catechism, and told us, how his Book had been approved by many Bishops, and Cardinals, and by the present Pope himself, and therefore has the *Autority of the See Apostolick*.

To this I answered in my Reply (p. 44.) that the attestation given to Cardinal *Bellarmin's* Controversies was not infe-

tior to that given to the Bishop of *Condom's* Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholick Church; that it was Dedicated to Pope *Sixtus 5.* and that with the Pope's leave and good liking, which is not much inferior to a testimonial under the Popes hand; and why then are not *Bellarmin's* Controversies as authentick a rule for the Exposition of the Catholick Faith, as the Bishop of *Condom's*? But to this he thought fit to answer nothing.

And whereas he pretends that the Popes approbation gives it the authority of the *Apostolick See*: I acquainted him out of *Melchior Canus*; That the name of the *Apostolick See* does not signify the Pope in his private capacity, but in his Chair, or doing such things, and in such a manner, as belong to the Papal Chair, that is, not giving his own private sense, but proceeding in Council with the Advice of good and learned Men; and therefore that is not to be accounted the Judgment of the *Apostolick See*, which is given only by the Bishop of Rome, privately, maliciously, and inconsiderately, or with the Advice only of some few of his own mind, but what he determines upon a due examination of the thing, by the Advice and Counsel of many wise Men.

Page 5.

To this the Protestor answers, that it is only an ungrounded and ill turned consequence, that because that is not to be accounted the judgment of the *Apostolick See*, which is given only by the Pope, privately, maliciously, and inconsiderately, or with the Advice only of some few of his own mind, therefore this learned Prelates Exposition of the Catholick Faith is to be thrown by, as of no Authority; so that our Replier has here concluded without any more ado, that the approbation of this Book was only given privately, maliciously, inconsiderately, or else with the Advice only of some few of the Popes own mind, otherwise the Consequence will not hold. But I thought *Canus* had told us, what was necessary to make the Popes approbation the judgment of the *Apostolick See*, as well as what hinders it from being so. That the Pope must give judgment according to the due form and method of proceedings belonging to the *Apostolick Chair*, in full Council, after due examination, and with the Advice of many wise Men. Now I only desire to know, whether the Pope in a full Council of Cardinals, did give judgment *ex Cathedra*, that the Bishop of *Condom's* Book was a true Exposition of the Catholick Faith; For if he did not, though the Pope and all his Cardinals should singly for themselves give their own private judgment and approbation of it, according to *Canus* his rule, it is not

not the judgment of the Apostolick See ; for it is a private judgment , whether it be malicious or not , which I was so far from *concluding without more ado*, that, as the Protester observes, I did not so much as translate it, (though I put it in the Latine Quotation in the Margin, which is an argument I did not designedly conceal it) because I thought it was needless to my purpose : and yet the Consequence holds good without it, if it be not a judgment *ex Cathedra*, it is not the judgment of the Apostolick See, which was all I intended to prove ; and our Author in his long harangue has said nothing to prove that it was, nay is so far from that, that he avoided the very mentioning of that, because he knew not what to say to it. *Maliciously and inconsiderately* were pretty words to descant upon, but the *Cathedra* choaked him.

The truth is, the principal Commendation, which is given to the Bishop of *Condom's* Book, is, that it is a new way of dealing with Hereticks, and that which they hope may be more effectual than Disputing has been ; but there is none of them, that make it the Rule, much less the only Rule of the Catholick Faith. Cardinal *de Buillon* acquaints Cardinal *Bona*, that there are some (and he speaks of Catholics) who find some faults in it ; and Cardinal *Sigismond Chigi* in his Letter to the Abbot of *Dangeau*, though he highly commends him, yet is far from allowing his Book to be the Standard of the Catholick Faith, or the Authentick Interpretation of the Council of *Trent*, when he tells the Abbot, certainly it was never his (*Condom's*) intention to give the interpretation of the Tenets of the Council, but only to deliver them in his Book rightly explicated, in such sort, that Hereticks may be convinced : that is, he did not allow him to interpret the Council, but commends him for dealing with Hereticks in a new, and, as he thought, more advantageous method, than had been formerly used ; and to this purpose the Pope commends him, that his Exposition of the Catholick Faith contains such Doctrine, and is composed in such a method, and with so much prudence, that it is thereby rendered proper to instruct the Readers clearly in few words, and to extort even from the unwilling, a confession of the Catholick Faith. Now to me this seems to fall very short of making the Bishop's Exposition the Authentick Interpretation of the Council of *Trent* ; that what ever the Bishop of *Condom* says, is the sense of the Council, must be acknowledged to be so, though other, as good Catholick Divines, as famous in their Generation,

and whose Books have been received with as universal approbation, are of another mind ; and which signifies a little with us Protestants , where the plain words and reason of the Council is against him.

I would desire our Author to tell me, whether the Pope, when he approved the Bishop of Condom's Book, did at the same time condemn Cardinal Bellarmin's, or those other Divines and Schoolmen, who give such a different explication of the Council of Trent, from what this Bishop does ; if he did not, what Authority has he given to this Exposition, more than any other Catholick Doctor may challenge ? Why may we not, if we please, follow Bellarmin, or Suarez, or Vasquez, or Cajetan, as well as Condom ? Our Author thinks it the shortest and easiest way to decide this Controversie whether he have truly Represented the Faith of a Papist, by making an experiment : Thus he concluded his Reflections, p. 19. *Do but you, or any Friend for you (though I did not know before, that the Church of Rome would admit Proxies in the profession of our Faith) give your assent to those Articles of Faith, as I have Represented it, in the very form and manner as I have stated them, in that Character of a Papist Represented ; and if upon your Request, you are not admitted into the Communion of the Roman Catholicks, and owned to believe aright in all those points. I'll then confess, that I have abused the World, that my Representing is Misrepresenting the Faith of the Papist.* To this I answered in my Reply, p. 40. that I did believe that his Representation was the Faith of a Papist, excepting what concerned the deposing Doctrine, and some few other points, which I had before particularly remarked (not that this is the whole of what Papists believe, but that it is right as far it goes) but we did not like his Faith so well, as he had Represented it, as to make the experiment. This I thought had been answer enough for any reasonable man, but in his Answer to the Reply, he is still for new experiments, as being much easier than Disputing, which he does not like, and now the trial is, *That if notwithstanding my refusal to admit the deposing Doctrine, and the Popes Infallibility, but as stated by the Representor (that is, nor as Articles of Faith) I be not judged sufficiently qualified as to these points, to be received into the Communion of the Roman Catholicks, then he will grant, that I have Reason to charge the Representor not to have done his part in these particulars, that is, not to have truly Represented the Faith of a Papist.*

Papists Pro-
test. p. 29.

Now

Now in answer to this, I beg his leave, that I may take my turn too in making Proposals, and I will do it very gravely, without the least smile, since I see he is offended at it, and that is this. Suppose I should resolve to be a thorough-paced Papist, and instead of assenting to his Representation, should rather chuse that Representation, which Cardinal *Bellarmino* has made of the Faith of a Papist, who does not mince the matter, as to worshipping Images, and praying to Saints, and trusting in their aid and assistance, &c. who makes the Pope's Infallibility and his Deposing Power an Article of Faith; should I be thought sufficiently qualified, as to these Points (wherein the Cardinal expressly contradicts and condemns our Authors, and the Bishop of *Condom's* Representation) to be received into the Communion of Roman Catholics? If I should (and I will venture the Protector to say, that I should not) then if his Argument from Experience be good; it is plain, that Cardinal *Bellarmino* has made a true Representation of the Roman Catholick Faith; and thus we have Experience for both sides, for Cardinal *Bellarmino*, and for the Bishop of *Condom*, and our Representer; and yet it is somewhat strange, they should be all true Representers, especially in those points, wherein they contradict each other.

This the Bishop of *Condom* was aware of, and therefore concludes his Book with a Caution against it to those, who should think fit to answer it. *That it would be a quitting the design of this Treatise, to examine the different Methods which Catholick Divines make use of, to establish or explicate the Doctrine of the Council of Condom's Ex-Trent, and the different Consequences, which particular Doctors have pos. p. 54. drawn from it.* Which is a plain Confession, that other Catholick Divines do not agree with him in this Method, nor allow of those narrow Bounds, which he has set to the Catholick Faith; and therefore it was wisely done of him to persuade his Answerers, to take no notice of any such Disagreement, and it will be a great piece of Civility and good Breeding in them not to do it; but how other Catholick Divines will take this, I cannot tell.

This is enough in all Conscience concerning the Bishop of *Condom's* Authority, which I must still say is *nothing*, when we speak of an Authentick Rule of expounding the Catholick Faith, in which sence our Author appeals to him; though we will allow him the Authority of a wise and prudent man, whose writings are published and approved by Publick Authority, as the writings of other Catholick Doctors are, which is all the Authority we Protestants

testants give to our best Writers ; and therefore the Protestor has no reason to complain (as he does, p. 27.) of an *uneven kind of Justice and Reasoning* in this matter, and whoever desires a more particular account of the Bishop of Condom's Authority, and those Glorious Testimonies which are given to his Book, if he be a reasonable man, may find satisfaction in the Preface to the late Answer to the Bishop of Condom.

But the truth is, I know no reason there is for all this Dispute. I told the Reflector before, that I did not like his Faith, though it were as he has represented it ; should we allow the Bishop of Condom's Exposition, and his Character of a Papist represented, to contain the true Catholick Faith, and that this is the whole of what the Council of *Trent* has determined, yet I can never be of this Religion ; and since he was not satisfied with my bare telling him so, I will now give him some Reasons for it, and particularly shew him, what it is I dislike in *Monsieur de Meaux*, the late Bishop of Condom's Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church about the Object of Worship, Invocation of Saints, and Worship of Images, and take the flourishes of his Introduction into the bargain. And I chuse these Heads, because these are the matters, wherein he principally appeals to the Bishop of Condom, and about which only he has offered any thing like an Argument, in his answer to my Reply : And I am as glad to take any opportunity of useful Discourse, as our Author seems cautious not to give any. And that neither he nor the Bishop may have any occasion of Quarrel, I shall observe the Directions the Bishop has given to those, who think fit to answer to his Treatise.

He tells us, *To urge any thing solid against this Treatise (the Exposition) and which may come home to the point, it must be proved, that the Churches Faith is not here faithfully expounded, and that by Acts, which the same Church has obliged her self to receive; or else it must be shewn, that this Explication leaves all the Objections in their full force, and all the disputes untouched; or in fine it must be precisely shewn, in what this Doctrine subverts the foundations of Faith. As for the first of these, it is done already to my hand, in the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly represented, in answer to the Papist mis-represented and represented. And he must be as bold a man, who will attempt to mend that Author, as who attempts to confute him. The other two I will have in my eye in examining, as far as I am now concerned, Monsieur de Meaux late*
Bishop

Bishop of *Condom* his Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church in matters of Controversie.

S E C T. I.

The Design of this Treatise.

WERE it possible to reconcile the Differences between us and the Church of *Rome*, only by a fair Representation of matters in Controversie between us ; I should think it an admirable Design ; and this being all the Author professes to intend, I cannot but highly commend his good Meaning in it ; whether he has shewn so much Skill and Judgment, in undertaking a Design in its own nature impracticable, I shall leave to the Reader to judge, when he has fairly heard both sides. Had I known no more of the matter, but that the Reformation was begun by men brought up in the Communion of the Church of *Rome*, and intimately acquainted with the Doctrines and Practices of that Church ; that some of these Corruptions, both before and since, have been complained of by men of that Communion ; that the Council of *Trent*, which was convened upon this occasion, condemns many Doctrines of the Reformers, as contrary to the Catholick Faith, and guilty of Heresie ; that both before and after this Council, there have been many Volumes written, and many fierce Disputes between Popish and Protestant Divines ; who have been men of as great Learning and true Understanding in these matters, as any the Age has bred, who did all this while believe, that there was a real and substantial difference between them : I say, when I consider these things, I should not venture, for the Reputation both of Papists and Protestants, especially of the Council of *Trent*, to say, That the Dispute has been only about Words ; that Papists and Protestants, even the most Learned men among them, have mistaken each others Propositions ; and that the only way to reconcile this Difference is so to state the Matter in Dispute, that Papists and Protestants may understand each other. I doubt not, but fierce men on both sides, may have made this difference much wider than it is : but yet such a difference there is, as no Representing can cure, as I believe will appear by considering particulars.

SECT. II.

Those of the Reformed Religion acknowledge, that the Catholick Church embraces all the Fundamental Articles of the Christian Religion.

THat the Church of *Rome* does profess to believe all the Principal and Fundamental Articles of Faith, as the Bishop affirms, I readily grant; but yet she may hold Fundamental Errors, and destroy that Faith she professes, by other Doctrines destructive of the true Catholick Faith. That this is possible, he cannot deny, for men may believe inconsistent Propositions; and the design of his Book is so to explicate the peculiar Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, as to reconcile them with the Fundamental Articles of Faith, which the Protestant Explication of Popish Doctrines contradicts and overthrows; which had been a very needless Undertaking, were it impossible for men, who believe all the Fundamental Articles of the Christian Faith, to believe any thing contrary to it. He might then have spared his pains in vindicating and explaining particular Doctrines; for it had been evidence enough, that such Doctrines and Practices do not overthrow any Fundamental Article of Faith, because they are owned by that Church, which professes to believe all Fundamental Articles.

And therefore I cannot well guess, what advantage he promised himself from this. We may safely grant, that the Church of *Rome* believes all Fundamental Articles, and yet charge her with such Doctrines and Practices, as destroy and tear up Foundations.

He observes indeed from *M. Daille*, that we ought not to charge men with believing such Consequences, as they themselves do formally reject; nor do we charge any such thing upon the Church of *Rome*, but *M. Daille* never said, that we may not charge mens Doctrines and Practices with such Consequences, as they, who teach these Doctrines, disown; for *M. Daille* himself, in the place quoted by the Bishop, charges the Opinion of the *Lutherans*, and of the Church of *Rome*, about the manner of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament, with inferring the destruction of the Humanity of *Jesus Christ*: and therefore the Bishop concludes too much, when he

he infers; It is then a certain *Maxime* established amongst them; that they must not in these cases look upon the Consequences, which may be drawn from a Doctrine, but purely upon what he propoſes and acknowledges, who teaches it. But the use *M. Daille* makes of it, is only this: That when ſuch ill conſequences, as mens Doctrines are juſtly chargeable with, have no ill influence upon Worſhip, or as he ſpeaks, no poſſon in them; if they diſown ſuch conſequences, this ought not to break Chriſtian Communion. And therefore, though no man ought to be received into the Communion of the Church, who denies the Humanity of Jeſus Chriſt; yet the National Synod at *Charenton* admits Lutherans to the Holy Table; becauſe whatever might be inferred from their Doctrine, yet they expreſſly owned the Humanity of Chriſt; and this Doctrinal conſequence was a meer ſpeculative Error, which made no change at all in Acts of Worſhip; but when the conſequences are not meerly ſpeculative, but practical, and do not ſo much concern what other men believe, and think, as what we our ſelves are to do, as it is in the Worſhip of Saints and Images, and the Hoſt, &c. to ſay, that we muſt have no regard to conſequences, if the Church diſowns them, is to ſay, that we muſt not conſider the nature and tendency of our Actions, nor what they are in Gods account, but only what the Church thinks of them: and therefore though we will not charge the *Church of Rome*, with believing any conſequences, which ſhe diſowns; yet if her Doctrines and Practices corrupt the Chriſtian Faith and Worſhip, it is fit to charge her with ſuch Corruptions; and if the Charge be juſt, though ſhe diſown it, it will juſtify our Separation from her Communion.

SECT. III.

Religious Worſhip is terminated in God alone.

THE account the Biſhop gives of that *Interior Adoration* which is due to God alone, is very ſound and Orthodox; that it conſiſts principally in believing he is the Creator and Lord of all things, and in adhering to him with all the powers of our Soul, by Faith, Hope, and Charity, as to him alone, who can render us happy by the Communication of an infinite Good, which is himſelf. But there are two things I except againſt in this Section, as not fairly ſtated: Firſt, concerning

cerning the exterior marks of Adoration. Secondly, concerning the terminating of Religious Worship.

As for the first, he tells us, *This interior Adoration, which we render unto God in Spirit and in Truth, has its exterior marks, of which the principal is Sacrifice, which cannot be offered to any but to God.* And with respect to the second, he tells us, *The same Church teaches us, that all Religious Worship ought to terminate in God, as its necessary end; and that if the Honour which she renders to the Blessed Virgin, and to the Saints, may in some sense be called Religious, it is for its necessary relation to God.*

See a late
Treat of the
Object of Reli-
gious Worship.

The Bishop very well knew, that this is the main Seat of the Controversie between us, and had he intended by his Exposition, to have put an end to our disputes; he should have taken a little more care about this Point; for as he has now stated it, he has left the matter just as he found it. We say, *That all Religious Worship ought not only to terminate in God, as its necessary End; but that God is the sole and immediate Object of all Religious Worship, and that we must worship none besides him, as our Saviour expounds the Law: Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve, Mat. 4.* We have always denied any relative Worship to be due to Creatures; for to worship Creatures, is to make them Gods, and it is no honour to the Supreme God, to advance his own Creatures to divine Honours, to make more, though inferior, Gods for God's sake. We say, all external Acts of Religious Worship, are peculiar and appropriate to God, as well as Sacrifice; for since we must worship none but God, whatever can be called Religious Worship, must be given to none besides him; and the Bishop has not dealt plainly in this matter; he says, that Sacrifice can be offered to none but God, but he has not told us, what he thinks of other external Acts of Worship, whether they may be paid to some excellent Creatures: for since Sacrifice is not a natural but instituted Worship, if nothing but Sacrifice is peculiar to God, then all external natural Worship is common to God and Creatures; and then in the state of Nature there could be no external and visible difference between the worship of God and Creatures; nor had there been any under the Gospel neither, had not Christ instituted his last Supper, which the Church of Rome has transformed into a Sacrifice of his natural Flesh and Blood.

Thus when he says, that all Religious Worship ought to terminate in God; as its necessary end; this seems to me an ambiguous Expression:

pression: for Worship properly terminates in the Object to which it is given; and in this sense, if all Religious Worship must terminate in God, then all Religious Worship must be given to God, and to none else; which is the true Catholick Faith, that God is only to be worshipped. But then what becomes of that Religious Worship which is given to the *Virgin Mary, and Saints, in relation to God*? Does not this Worship which is given to them, terminate in them, and not in God? Are not they the immediate and proper Objects of that Worship, which is given to them? And does not the Object terminate the Worship? Is God the Object of that Worship, which they give to the Saints and Blessed Virgin? Then they either give that inferior degree of Worship to God, which is proper for Creatures, which is an affront to his Majesty and Greatness; or they give that Worship to Creatures, which is proper to God, which is Idolatry. Which plainly shews, that that Worship which is given to Creatures, is terminated in those Creatures to which it is given; and therefore if any degree of Religious Worship be given to Creatures, all Religious Worship does not terminate in God, as he said it must; and if all Religious Worship must terminate in God, then no Religious Worship must be given to Creatures, as he grants it may, to the *Virgin Mary and Saints*.

Yes, you will say, that Worship which is given to the Saints and Blessed Virgin, terminates in God, because it is given them upon account of their Relation to God; but this is a great mistake; their Relation to God can only serve for a reason why they are worshipped, but cannot terminate that worship on God which is given to them; because not God, but they themselves are the Object, and the ultimate Object of that Worship which is given to them.

Though we should grant that God is honoured by that Worship which is given to some excellent Creatures, who are his Friends and Favourites, yet the Honour we do to God in this, is of a very different nature from that Worship which we pay to Creatures; it does not consist in this, that the worship we give to Creatures is terminated on God, for it is terminated upon those Creatures whom we worship; but the Honour must consist in the reason of our worship, that we worship them for God's sake: It is an honour to God by interpretation and consequence, as we intend it for God's Honour, or as God is pleased to think himself honoured by it; but it is no act of Worship to God, and there-

therefore not terminated on him. The Worship can go no further than its proper Object, though the Reason of the Worship may: For there is a great deal of difference between an Object, and a Medium of Worship; a Medium of Worship, which is only a representative Object, receives our Worship, but does not terminate it, but convey it to that Being it represents; because it is worshipped only in the place and stead of another, as it is in that Worship which is given to the Images of Christ and the Saints; which some Divines of the Church of *Rome* tell us, is not terminated on the Images, but on Christ or the Saints represented by those Images; but a proper Object of Worship, which receives worship in its own proper person, for whatsoever reason it is worshipped, it terminates the Worship; the Worship which is given to it, goes not beyond it self, though the Reason of the Worship may reach farther, and be thought to reflect some Honour upon God, and to testify our Love and Reverence for him, by that Worship we pay to those who are dear to him. So that if we do give Religious Worship to the Virgin *Mary* and Saints, such Worship is terminated on them, and then all Religious Worship is not terminated on God, as he says the *Church of Rome* teaches it must be, which yet teaches also the worship of Saints and the Blessed Virgin. Methinks he should have taken care to have stated this matter a little plainer: for if he cannot reconcile the Doctrine and Practice of the Church together, I fear his Exposition will rather increase than end controversies.

Thus how doubtfully does he speak; *If the Honour she renders to the Blessed Virgin and to the Saints, may, in some sense, be called Religious, it is for its necessary Relation to God.* Why does he not tell us plainly, whether this Honour the *Church of Rome* gives to Saints and the Virgin, be Religious or not, and in what sense it may be called Religious Honour? If he undertake to expound the Catholick Faith, why does he not do it? Why does he speak so cautiously? as if he were afraid to own what the Faith of the Church is in this point: which yet is a very material one, and very necessary to be truly stated. Thus I can understand how the Honour which is given to Creatures, may have relation to God, *viz.* because we honour them for God's sake, and upon account of their relation to him; but I do not understand how this relation to God, makes the Honour of Creatures a Religious Honour. For though we honour Creatures for God's sake, yet the Honour we give to Creatures must be suitable to their own Natures,

rares, and therefore not that Religious Honour which is proper to God only: As when we honour a man for the sake of our Father, or our Prince, we do not give him that Honour which is proper to our Father, or our Prince, though we honour him for their sakes. And therefore if the *Church of Rome* does give Religious Honour to any Creatures, it will not justify her, in giving Religious Honour to Creatures, that she honours them for God's sake; for Creatures are Creatures still, though never so nearly related to God, and therefore not capable of Religious Honours.

So that I do not see how this Explication, if it may be so called, takes off any Objection, that was ever made against the Church of *Rome*, about the Object of Religious Worship. For if by *all Religious Worship being terminated on God*, he means, that no other Being must be religiously worshipped but only God; then this is an invincible Objection against that Religious Worship, which the *Church of Rome* gives to the Blessed Virgin, and to Saints and Angels. If he means by it, that Religious Worship may be given to other beings besides God, so it be all *terminated* in God, then all the other Objections, against worshipping any other Being besides God, are in full force still, notwithstanding his Explication: their Relation to God will not justify the Religious Worship of Creatures, and it is contrary to all Sense and Reason to say, That the Worship which is given to Creatures, is terminated on God.

SECT. IV.

Invocation of Saints.

There are two great Opinions against that Worship which the *Church of Rome* gives to Saints departed, who now reign with Christ in Heaven, as the *Council of Trent* teaches. 1. That it is to give them that Religious Worship which is due only to God. 2. That it makes them our Mediators and Intercessors in Heaven, which is an Honour peculiar to Christ. Now *M. de Meaux*, and after him, the Author of the Character, think to remove these Objections, only by explaining the Doctrine of their Church about this matter; and I shall distinctly consider, what they say to each of these.

1. As for the first, That in praying to Saints they do not give them that Worship, which is due only to God, they think is evident

dent from hence, That the Council of Trent and the Catechism *ad Parochos* teaches them only, to pray to Saints to pray for them: The Bishop takes great pains to prove this to be the sense of the Council, and therefore, *That in what terms soever those Prayers, which we address to Saints, are couched, the Intention of the Church, and of her Faithful, reduces them always to this Form.* Now I will not dispute this matter at present, but refer my Reader to the *Answer to a Papist Mis-represented.*

But let us suppose, that this is all the Church of Rome intends by it, that we should only pray to the Saints to pray for us, what advantage can they make of this? Yes, says the Advertisement before the Bishops Exposition, p. 12. *To pray to Saints only to pray for us, is a kind of Prayer, which by its own nature, is so far from being reserved by an Independent Being to himself, it can never be addressed to him: That is, we must never pray to God to pray for us; and therefore such a Prayer is no part of that Worship which is due to God.* And he adds, *If this Form of Prayer, pray for us, diminished the trust we have in God, it would be no less condemnable to use it to the Living than to the Dead; and St. Paul would not have said so often, Brethren, pray for us: the whole Scripture is full of Prayers of this nature.* Thus the Author of the Character tells us, *In this he does not at all neglect coming to God, or rob him of his honour, but directing all his Prayers up to him, and making him the ultimate Object of all his Petitions, He only desires sometimes the just on Earth, sometimes those in Heaven, to joyn their Prayers to his, that so the number of Petitioners being increased, the Petition may find better acceptance in the sight of God: and this is not to make them Gods, but only Petitioners to God: He having no hopes of obtaining any thing, but of God alone.*

Papist Mis-re-
presented, p. 3.
Ed. 2.

This is the least that can possibly be made of that Worship they give to Saints, which is not reconcileable with their practice neither; and if it should appear, that this (as little as it is thought to be) is to give that Worship to Creatures, which is due to God, they must e'en reject praying to Saints to pray for them, as they now do, trusting in their aid and assistances, and power to keep them.

Now I only ask, whether Prayer be not an Act of Religion, and a worship due to God? if it be not, why do they pray to God? if it be, then they give the worship of God to Saints, when they pray to them. For it is not so much the matter of our Prayer, as the nature of Prayer, which makes it an Act of Religion. We may pray to God for those things, which men can give, viz. Food and

and Raiment, and yet these are as religious Prayers, as when we ask such things of God, as none can give but himself; and by the same reason, though we pray to Saints only to do that for us, which a creature can do, that is, only to pray to God for us; yet our very praying to them is an Act of religious worship, which is due only to God.

The truth is, I am so dull, that I cannot see what makes these new Reformers of the Roman-Catholick Doctrine and Worship, so shy of owning any other *aid and assistance*, which they expect from the Saints, but only their Prayers for them: for this makes no alteration at all in the nature of that worship, they pay to them. For suppose the Saints in Heaven (who now reign with *Christ*, as the Council affirms) were intrusted with the Guardianship of men, and the care of Saints on Earth, as Cardinal Bellarmine expressly says they are; might we not as lawfully pray to them to employ that power God has committed to them, for our good and happiness, as to use their interest with God for us by their Prayers? Does one exalt you more above the condition of creatures than the other? May we not beg our Friends on Earth to relieve our wants and necessities, as well as to pray for us? And if begging the Prayers of our Friends on Earth, will justify our praying to the Saints in Heaven to pray for us, our asking an Alms on Earth, will equally justify our begging the aid and assistance, as well as Prayers, of the Saints in Heaven; and then we are just where we were. And if ever there were any good Arguments against praying to Saints, they are all good still, though they pray to Saints only to pray for them: which is my only business at present, to shew (according to the Bishop's desire) *that his Exposition leaves all the Objections in full force, and all the Disputes untouched.*

So that setting aside the matter of our Prayers, or what it is we ask, which makes no alteration in this case, the inquiry is, Whether when we pray to Saints, we do not give that worship to them which is peculiar and appropriate to God?

Now the *Church of Rome* is so far from thinking such Prayers to be the peculiar worship due to God, that she thinks it as innocent to pray to the Saints in Heaven to pray for us, as it is to desire the Prayers of our Christian Brethren on Earth. The Bishop says, *The Church in teaching us, that it is profitable to pray to Saints, teaches us to pray to them in the same spirit of Charity, and according to the same order of fraternal Society, which moves us to demand assistance of our Brethren living on Earth.* The Character to the same purpose makes.

Bellarmin. de sanct. beatit. l. 1. c. 20. & c. 18.

makes our desiring sometimes the Saints on Earth, sometimes those in Heaven, to join their Prayers with ours, to be Actions of the very same nature, and equally lawful. This is the true pinch of the Controversie, and here it is we part with the Church of Rome; that we think there is some difference between speaking to our Christian Brethren on Earth, whom we see, and converse with, and praying to the Saints in Heaven, with all the external expressions of Religious Worship and Adoration: The first is to converse with them as men; the second is such a manner of Address, as is proper only for a God.

To pray to Saints, is somewhat more than to desire our Christian Friends to pray for us; it is *suppliciter eos invocare*, as the Council of Trent speaks, to invoke them, or call on them, in the manner of Supplicants; so that this must be acknowledged a Worship of the Saints; and then it must be either a civil or religious Worship; and which of these two it is, must be known by the manner of paying it. And therefore when all the circumstances of worship are religious, we must acknowledge the worship to be religious too: Such as praying to them in religious places, in Churches and Chappels, and at consecrated Altars, with bended knees, and hands and eyes lifted up, in a very devout manner, when they see nobody to speak to, or to receive their Addresses, unless it be the Image of the Saint they worship. Thus some Nations worship their Gods, but no People ever paid their civil respects to each other in this manner.

But as I observed in my Reply, (p. 66.) There is one infallible distinction between civil and religious worship, between the worship of God and men: That the worship of the invisible Inhabitants of the other World, has always been accounted religious worship. Civil respects are confined to this World, as all natural and civil Relations, which are the foundation of civil respects, are; but we have no intercourse with the other World, but what is religious. And therefore as the different kinds and degrees of civil honour are distinguished by the sight of the Object, to which they are paid, though the external acts and expressions are the same; as when men bow the body, and are uncovered, you know what kind of honour it is, by seeing who is present, whether their Father, their Friend, or their Prince, or some other Honourable Person: So the most certain mark of distinction between civil and religious worship, is this, that the one relates to this World, the other to the invisible Inhabitants of the next. In this last Paragraph the Protester says (p. 35.) We have a Consequence and Comparison, and both so excellent in their kinds, that

that if any better connexion can be found in them, then between the Monument and the May-pole, it must be by one, who has found one trick more in Logick, than ever Aristotle knew. Sometimes indeed, Aristotle's Logick does not do such feats, as one would expect; but a little natural Logick, called common Sense, would have shewed him the connexion. For I think, there is some sence in saying, that as the different degrees of civil honour, though most of the external signs of honour be the same, such as kneeling, bowing the body, uncovering the head, may yet be distinguished by the presence of the Object, to which it is paid; whether it be our Father, or our Prince: So though the external signs of civil and religious honour, are in many instances the same, yet civil and religious worship may be visibly distinguished, by the Object to which it is given: For civil worship can belong only to the Inhabitants of this World; but whatever worship is given to the invisible Inhabitants of the other World, is religious.

Now if this be so, then to pray to Saints, now they are removed out of this World into an invisible state, is to give religious worship to them; which makes a vast difference between praying to the Saints in Heaven to pray for us, and speaking to our fellow-Christians on Earth to pray for us.

The Protestor is willing to grant, or at least suppose, that the honour or worship, which is given to the invisible Inhabitants of the other World, is religious worship; but still he says, it remains to be proved, *that all religious respect and honour is so a divine, Papiſts Pro-*
honour, as to make a God of the thing, to which it is paid, at least *con-*
structively: This I think, is no hard matter to do; but I shall first *trif. P. 33.*
consider his Arguments against it, and all that he says, is, That if it be true, it proves too much, and will bring my self in for a share with them, in giving religious worship to creatures, and so making Gods of them, at least constructively. He instances in that Custom of bowing to the Altar, or Communion Table, as he calls it, and bowing at the Name of Jesus; but this shall be considered, when I come to the worship of Images. His other instances concern *that religious respect, which we allow due to sacred places and things, and a religious decency to the bodies of Saints and Martyrs*; but what is this to a religious worship. The respect we shew to such things and places, is no more than a civil respect which consists in a decent usage, in separating them from vile and common purposes; and it is called a religious respect, not from the nature of the respect, but from the reason, why we give it, viz. out of reverence

to God, to whose worship they are separated. Thus that love and honour we pay to a living Saint, though it rise no higher than the expressions of a civil respect, may be said to be religious, when we love and honour them for God's sake; but this is an external denomination from the Cause and motive, not from the nature of the Act, and therefore cannot make Gods of them, because it is not religious worship; but to give proper religious worship to any Being, is to give it that worship, which is proper only to God, which is the only way to make any Being a God, which is not a God.

Now if this be a true notion, that all worship, which is given to the invisible Inhabitants of the other World, is religious worship, I will easily prove, that we must worship no other invisible Being, but God alone, and therefore cannot pray to Saints in Heaven, without giving the worship of God to them.

And my reason is this, Because God challenges all religious worship to himself; as our Saviour tells us, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*, Matth. 4. It seems to me a very needless dispute, what is the peculiar and incommunicable Worship, which must be given to none but the Supreme God, when God has appropriated all Religious Worship to himself, whatever act of Religious Worship God requires us to pay to himself, must be given to none else; and therefore if all worship paid to invisible Beings, be in its own Nature Religious Worship, we must worship no Invisible Being, but only God. For if all Worship of Invisible Beings be Religious, and God challenges all Religious Worship to himself, then we must Worship no Invisible Being but only God; for to worship any other Invisible Being, is to give Religious Worship to that, which is not God.

Page 35.

But the Protestor thinks I ought to have allowed, for the different *Kinds and Degrees of Religions, as well as Civil Honour*. Such I suppose as they call their *Latria* or *Dulia*, Supreme or Subordinate Absolute or Relative, Terminative or Transient Worship; but there is no place for these different Degrees and Distinctions of Religious Worship, if we must Worship no other Invisible Being, but only God; for if there be but one Object of Religious Worship, there is no need to distinguish this Worship into different Kinds and Degrees, as Civil Worship is, which has very numerous and very different Objects. If we must give no Worship to any invisible Being besides God, it is ridiculous to dispute, what Degree of Worship we may lawfully give them, when we must give them none.

And

And it is a good Argument, that there are no different Kinds of Religious Worship; one which is Supreme and Sovereign, and due to the one Supreme God; other Inferiour and Subordinate Degrees of Worship, which may be paid to those Excellent Spirits, which are very dear to God, and the Ministers of his Providence; because there are no external and visible Signs, to distinguish between such different Degrees of Religious Worship. As Civil Worship is confined to the Inhabitants of this World, and is thereby distinguished from Religious Worship; so the different Degrees of civil Honour, though the External Signs and Expressions of it are the same, are distinguished by the visible Presence of the Object to which it is paid; for when a man bows or uncovers his head, we know what kind of Honour it is, by considering the Relation, or the Quality of the Person, to whom it is paid, whether he be a Father, a Prince, or a wise and good man. But if there were more Invisible Beings than one to worship, though there might be different Degrees of Internal Honour and Worship paid to them, according to the different Apprehensions men had of their several Degrees of Perfection; yet the External Signs of Worship must be the same in all. And thus there would be no visible distinction, between the Worship of the Supreme God, and Created Spirits, and Glorified Souls of dead men; and therefore if it be necessary to distinguish, between the Worship of God and Creatures, we must Worship no Invisible Being; but only the Supreme God.

The Proteſtor propoſes ſome ways, whereby *the different kinds and degrees of Religious Worship may be distinguished*; as by *the intention of the Giver*; but this is not a visible Distinction: For mens intentions are private to themselves, and there is no difference in the Visible Acts of Worship, to make such a distinction, or by *some Visible Representation*; that is, by Images: This I grant, would make as visible a Distinction between the Worship of God, and Christ, and the Virgin Mary, as the presence of the person distinguishes the Kinds and Degrees of Civil Honour, for when we see, whose Image they worship, we may certainly tell what Being they direct their Worship to; but the fault of this is, that it is forbid by the Law of God; of which more in the next Section; or by *Determination of other Circumstances*, but what these are, I cannot tell, and therefore can say nothing to it.

The Church of Rome indeed does appropriate the Sacrifice of the Mass to God, as his peculiar Worship, which must not be given

to any other Being; and if this be so, then indeed we can certainly tell, when we see a Priest offering the Sacrifice of the Mass, that he offers it to the Supreme God; but there are a great many other Acts of Worship, which we owe to God, besides the Sacrifice of the Mass, and in every Act of Worship, God ought to be visibly distinguished from Creatures; and yet if all the other External Acts of Worship be common to God, and Creatures, where is the distinction? And yet the Sacrifice of the Mass can be offered only by the Priest, so that the whole Laity cannot perform any one Act of Worship to God, which is peculiar to him, and therefore can make no Visible Distinction in their Worship between God and Creatures.

See Dr. Still-
ingfleet's de-
fence of the
discourse con-
cerning Idola-
try, p. 216, &c.

And yet the very Sacrifice of the Mass, is not so appropriated to God in the Church of Rome, but that it is offered to God in Honour of the Saints. This the Bishop of Condom (p. 7.) endeavours to excuse by saying; *This Honour which we render them (the Saints) in Sacrificing, consists in naming them in the Prayers we offer up to God, as his Faithful Servants, and in rendering him thanks for the Victories they have gained, and in humbly beseeching him, that he would vouchsafe to favour us by their Intercession.*

Now it is very true, according to the Council of Trent, the Priest offers the Sacrifice only to God, but they do somewhat more than name the Saints in their Prayers, for they offer the Sacrifice in Honour to the Saints, as well as to God, which the Bishops calls to *Honour the Memory of the Saints*: Now if Sacrifice be an Act of Honour and Worship to God, it sounds very oddly to worship or honour God for the Honour of his Saints, which seems to make God only the Medium of Worship to the Saints, who are the terminative object of it; and that the Saints are concerned in this Sacrifice appears from this, That by this Sacrifice they implore the *Intercession of the Saints*, that those whose *Memories we celebrate on Earth, would vouchsafe to intercede for us in Heaven.* The Bishop translates *implorat* by *Demand*, for what reason I cannot tell; and makes this *Imploring* or *Beseeching*, to refer to God, not to the Saints, whose *Patronage, Patrocinia*, and *Intercession* they pray, they would vouchsafe them, contrary to the plain Sense of the Council, and I think to common Sense too: For I do not well understand offering Sacrifice to God, that he may procure for us the *Intercession of the Saints*; for if he can be persuaded to favour us so far, as to intercede with the Saints to be our *Intercessors*, he may as well grant our *Requests* without their *Intercession*; and yet

yet the Bishop was very sensible, that if we offer up our Prayers to the Saints in the Sacrifice of the Mass, it does inevitably entitle them to the Worship of that Sacrifice, which, they say, must be offered only to God. He alledges indeed St. *Austin's* Authority, who understood nothing of this Mystery of the Sacrifice of the Mass, and how far he was from thinking of any thing of this nature, is evident to any man, who consults the place.

St. Aug. de Civit. Dei, l. 8. c. 27.

But the Church of *Rome* (as the Bishop observes p. 8.) has been charged by some of the Reformation, not only with giving the Worship of God to Creatures, when they pray to the Saints, but with attributing the Divine Perfections to them, such as a certain kind of *Immensity and Knowledge of the Secrets of Hearts*; for if they be not present in all places, where they are Worshipped, how can they hear the Prayers, which are made to them at such distant places at the same time? If they do not know our thoughts, How can they understand those mental Prayers, which are offered to them without Words, only in our secret Thoughts and Desires; for even such Prayers are expressly allowed by the Council, *voce vel mente*.

Now to this he answers very well, that though they believe the Saints do by one means or other know the Prayers, which are made to them, either by the Ministry and Communication of Angels, or by a particular Revelation from God, or in his Divine Essence, in which all Truth is comprised; yet never any Catholick, yet thought, the Saints knew our Necessities by their own power, no nor the Desires which move us to Address our secret Prayers to them. And to say a Creature may have a knowledge of these things, by a light communicated to them by God, is not to elevate a Creature above his Condition. This I grant, and therefore do acknowledge, that they do not attribute the Divine Perfections of Omniscience and Omnipresence to the Saints, either in thought or word, but yet actions have as natural a signification as words; and if we give them such a Worship, as naturally signifies Omniscience and Omnipresence, our Worship attributes the incommunicable Perfections of God to them. For it is unnatural and absurd to Worship a Being, who is not present to receive our Worship; to speak to a Being, who does not, and cannot hear us; and since God has made us reasonable Creatures, to understand what we do, and why, he interprets our actions, as well as words and thoughts, according to their natural signification. And herein the natural evil of Creature-worship consists, That every Act of Religious Worship does naturally

naturally involve in it a Confession of some excellency and perfection, which is above a created nature, and thereby (whatever the Worshipper thinks or intend) does attribute the incommunicable Glory of God to Creatures.

If the Saints are not present in all places to hear those Prayers which are made to them, and if they cannot hear in Heaven, what we say to them on Earth, *by their own Power*, then Prayer is a Worship, which is not due to their nature, even in a glorified state. For no Being can have a right to our Prayers, who cannot hear them; and though we should grant, that God reveals our Prayers to them, yet to know by Revelation is not to hear. In this case all that can be reasonable for us to do, is only secretly to desire, that the Saints would pray for us, which God can reveal to them, if he pleases, as well as our Prayers; but it can never be reasonable to pray to those, who cannot hear us.

And if Prayer cannot be due to a created Nature in its most exalted state, because no Creature can be present in all places to hear our Prayers, then if it be a proper Worship for Creatures, it must be so by a positive Institution of God; but then they must shew an express Command for it, and when they can do that, we will dispute the reason of the thing no longer.

And this is a manifest reason, why we should worship no other invisible Being besides God, because no other invisible Being is capable of our Worship. God alone fills all places, and therefore may be worshipped, though we do not see him, for he is present every-where to hear our Prayers; but we cannot know, that any Being, of a limited presence, is present with us, unless we see it; and it is unnatural to pray to any Being, who is not present to hear us.

And though the Church of *Rome* does not directly and positively attribute any divine Perfections to Saints, yet mankind are so naturally prone, to ascribe a kind of Divinity to immortal and invisible Spirits, that this is a sufficient reason, why God should not allow the worship of any invisible Spirits. For after all that can be said to the contrary, it is a mighty temptation to men, at least to make inferior Deities of those, to whom they constantly pay divine honours.

And though they do not attribute to Saints, a natural power to know our Thoughts, and to hear our Prayers, and to answer them: yet if this supernatural gift and power, whereby they do it, be as constant, and act as certainly as nature does, it is as
great

great and adorable a perfection, as if it were natural: for since all created Excellencies are the Gift of God, what mighty difference is there between a natural and supernatural perfection, or gift, if that which is supernatural, be as certain and lasting, and that which they can as constantly use, as that which is natural. As to take their own instance: Were the Gift of Propheſie, which God beſtowed on ſome in former Ages, as conſtant and certain, as natural knowledge; that they could uſe this Gift, whenever they pleaſed, and as conſtantly foretel things to come, as they could reaſon and diſcourſe; what difference would there be in this caſe, between a natural and ſupernatural knowledge of future things: truly no more but this; That a natural knowledge is a perfection, which God did originally beſtow upon our Nature: ſupernatural knowledge is an additional perfection, but yet upon this ſuppoſition, as inſeparably annexed to our Natures, as natural knowledge, and always as ready for uſe as that; which I think, would make ſuch a Prophet as truly venerable, as if Propheſie were natural to him.

Thus it is in this preſent caſe. If the Saints know our Prayers, by what means ſoever they do it, it muſt be as conſtant and laſting a Gift, as if it were natural; that is, they muſt as certainly know when, and what we pray for, every time we pray, as if they were preſent to hear us. For if they do not always know our Prayers, we can never know, when to pray, and can never have any ſecurity of their Interceſſion for us; many thouſand *Ave Marias* may be every day loſt, and turn to no account; and if they do conſtantly know this by a ſupernatural Gift, it is as glorious a perfection, as if this knowledge were natural. Mankind do not ſo critically diſtinguiſh between natural and ſupernatural Gifts; in whomſoever theſe perfections are, they are divine, and ſuch Creatures have a ſupernatural kind of Divinity annexed to their natures; they are made Gods, though not Gods by nature, which is as much as any people believe of their inferior Deities, who believe but one Supreme and Sovereign God, who is a God by nature.

And yet the Author of the Character of *A Papiſt Represented*, gives ſome inſtances, which would perſwade us, that the Saints have a natural knowledge of our Prayers. Thus he tells us, *That Abraham heard the Petitions of Dives, who was yet at a greater diſtance, even in Hell, and told him likewise his manner of living, while as yet on Earth*, (p. 4.) Now not to ask, how
he

he comes so exactly to know, where Hell is, and that it is at a greater distance from Heaven, than the Earth is: If there be any force in this Argument, it must prove, that the Saints have a natural knowledge of our Prayers, though at so great a distance from us, as Heaven is: That they see, and hear us, as *Abraham* did *Dives*, though we cannot see and hear them, as *Dives* did *Abraham*; which might have satisfied him, since he thinks fit to reason from Parables, that whatsoever distance there is between Heaven and Hell, there is a greater communication between them, than between Heaven and Earth. However our Saviour cannot here speak of any supernatural gift, whereby *Abraham* saw and heard *Dives* in Hell; unless we will say, that *Dives* did by a supernatural gift also, see and hear *Abraham* in Heaven; and therefore if this prove any thing, it proves, that Saints know and hear our Prayers by their own natural powers.

Thus he adds, *That the very Devils hear those desperate Wretches who call on them; and why then should he doubt, that Saints want this priviledge in some manner granted to sinful men and wicked spirits.* But though he calls this a Priviledge, I suppose, he means a natural one, unless he thinks, that the Devils hear Witches by a supernatural revelation, as the Saints in Heaven hear the Prayers of the Saints on Earth: But I always thought, that Devils had been a little nearer bad men, than the Saints in Heaven are to us on Earth; for they are confined to this lower Region, and therefore are often so near, as to see and hear bad men, though they are invisible themselves: and this is one reason, why God will not allow us to worship any invisible Spirits, because though we should intend only to worship good Spirits, and glorified Saints, yet bad Spirits, who are near and present, as having their residence in the Air, as the Devil is called the Prince of the Power of the Air, do assume this worship to themselves, and both corrupt the Worship, and abuse their Votaries, with lying Wonders. Thus they did in the times of Paganism, and whether they have more reverence for the Christian Saints, than they had for the Pagan Deities, in assuming their Names and Worship, let others consider.

But to return to the Bishop. He having assured us, that the Church of *Rome* does not ascribe any divine perfections to the Saints (of which the Reader may judge by what I have already discoursed) he thus concludes, *It is therefore true, that by examining what are our interiour Sentiments concerning the Saints, it will*

will be found we do not raise them above the condition of Creatures, Pag. 9.
and from thence we ought to judge, of what nature that exterior honour is, which we render them; exterior Veneration being established to testify the interior Sentiments of the mind: That is, we must conclude, they do not give the worship of God to them, because they do not believe them to be Gods. Now this, I confess, would be true, were the external signs of honour wholly arbitrary, and at our own choice; for then they could signify no more, than what we intend to signify by them, and we ought not to be charged with intending to signify more, than what we profess to intend; but when either the Act of Worship naturally signifies Divine Perfections, as Prayer to an invisible Being does, or God has reserved any Acts of Worship to himself, as he has done all Religious Worship, that is, all Worship paid to invisible Beings, as I have already shewn; in these cases we may be guilty of giving Divine Honours to Creatures, though in words and intention, we ascribe no Divine Perfections to them.

So that I cannot see, but that, after all the fine colours, and soft interpretations, which the Bishop puts upon this practice of the Church of Rome, in praying to Saints, the charge against them of giving the peculiar Worship of God to Creatures, is as strong and forcible as ever.

Secondly, let us now consider, whether our praying to the Saints, to pray and interceed for us, be not injurious to the Merits and Mediation of Christ. Now there are two things the Bishop urges to prove, that the Mediation of Saints is not injurious to the Mediation of Christ. 1. *That if the quality of Mediator, which the Scriptures gives to Jesus Christ, received any prejudice from the Intercession made to the Saints, who reign with God, it would receive no less from the intercession made to the Faithful who live with us.* For this he alledges the Authority of the Catechism ad Parochos, which tells us, *That if it were not lawful to desire help of the Saints, because we have one Patron or Mediator Jesus Christ, the Apostle would not so earnestly have desired the Prayers of the Brethren, who were then living, to God for him. For the Glory and Dignity of Christ, as Mediator, is not less diminished by the Prayers of the Living, than by the Intercession of Saints in Heaven.* Pag. 6.

Nam si propterea Subditiis sanctorum uti non liceat, quod unum patronum habemus Jesum Christum, nunquam id commississet Apostolus.

solus, ut se Deo tanto studio fratrum viventium precibus adjuvari vellet; neque enim minus vivorum preces, quam eorum, qui in Caelis sunt, sanctorum deprecatio, Christi Mediatoris gloriam & dignitatem imminuerint. *cap. Rom. part. 3. Tit. de cultu & veneratione sancti.*

This is the least that can be made of it, that the Mediation and Intercession of the Saints for us in Heaven, is no more than one Christians praying for another on Earth ; and I fear this is not reconcileable with the practice of the Church of *Rome* in this matter. For can this (if it be no more) be thought a sufficient foundation, for all that pompous worship of the Virgin *Mary*, and other powerful Saints ? Is this a good reason to erect Temples and Altars, consecrated not only to their Memory, but to their Honour ; to set up their Images in Holy Places, and pay our humble Adorations before them ; because they pray for us in Heaven, just as Christian Brethren pray for one another on Earth ?

And therefore I must needs say, the Bishop has not truly expounded the Doctrine of the Church of *Rome* in this point, which makes the Saints to be *our Mediators in Heaven* ; nor indeed Mediators of Redemption, which she acknowledges none to be but Christ, who has purchased us with his own Blood ; but Mediators of Intercession, who have so much interest, and favour, in the Court of Heaven, as powerfully to recommend those to God, who put themselves under their Patronage. This I confess makes a great difference between the Mediation of Christ, and of the Saints, and yet leaves a great distance between the Prayers of Saints in Heaven for us, and the mutual Intercessions of Christians for each other on Earth, and the Church of *Rome* never taught, that they were of the same nature ; for though the Catechism endeavours to prove, that the Mediation and Intercession of the Saints in Heaven for us, is not injurious to the Mediation of Christ ; because the Prayers of Christians for each other on Earth, are very reconcileable with the Honour of Christ's Intercession : yet it never teaches, that there is no difference between the Prayers of Saints in Heaven, and Christians on Earth ; and I think we ought to distinguish, between the Doctrine and the Arguments of the Church. What she declares to be her Doctrine we must own to be so, but I think we must not grant every thing to be her Doctrine which ought to be supposed to make her Arguments good ; because there is no necessity of granting, that all her Arguments must be good.

This Argument indeed, that the Intercession of the Saints in Heaven, is no more injurious to the Mediation of Christ, than the Prayers and Intercessions of the Saints on Earth for each other, cannot be good without supposing, that the Intercessions of the Saints in Heaven are of the very same nature, with the Prayers

ers of Christians for each other on Earth ; and the Bishop takes the advantage to represent this as the Doctrine of the Church, that *she teaches us to pray to Saints in the same spirit of Charity, and according to the same order of fraternal Society, which moves us to demand assistance of our Brethren living upon Earth.* But this I think is not reconcileable with the express words of the Council of Trent, which founds the Invocation of Saints upon their *reigning with Christ* ; which makes a vast difference between their interest and authority in the Court of Heaven, and the humble supplications of Christians on Earth. And I think *the spirit of Charity, and the order of fraternal Society,* does not require us *suppliciter invocare*, to pray to our fellow Christians on Earth *as humble Supplicants* to pray for us, as the Council teaches us to address our selves to the Saints in Heaven.

Christians indeed on Earth, and Saints in Heaven (since the Bishop has limited all their aid and assistance to their Prayers) can do no more then pray for us; and are thus both of them distinguished from Christ, who is our Mediator of Redemption, who has bought us with his blood : But then we ought to consider, that there is a vast difference in Prayers, and Prayers may prevail upon such different Reasons, as may quite alter the nature of the Intercession. For is there no difference between the power and interest of a Favourite, to obtain what he desires of his Prince, and the Petition of an ordinary Subject ? A Prince may grant the Petition of a Subject for himself, or of one Subject for another, where there is reason and equity in the case, without any more powerful intercession ; but acts of grace and favour must be dispensed by the intercessions of Favourites ; and yet it is all by way of Prayer and Petition to the Prince ; but though it is all but Petition and Request, yet those who have any Request to make to their Prince, place more confidence in the interest and power of one Favourite, than in the joyned Petitions of many ordinary Subjects.

Thus it is here ; Christians on Earth pray for each other as common Supplicants, and the benefit they expect from such Prayers and Intercessions, is only from the prevalency of Faith and Charity, which inspire such Prayers, and make them efficacious. God has commanded us to pray for one another, and has promised to hear our united, fervent, and importunate Prayers, for the merits of our common Saviour Jesus Christ : But those who pray to Saints in Heaven, pray to them as Favourites and Mediators, who prevail not merely by the force and efficacy of Prayer, but

by their personal Merits and Interests with God ; and this makes them just such Mediators as Christ is, who by their Power and Interest can recommend us and our Prayers to God's acceptance. No you'll say, Christ purchased us with his Blood, and mediates in the virtue of his Sacrifice, which makes his Mediation of a different nature from the Mediation of Saints, who mediate only by their interest with God, upon account of their personal Merits. But this alters not the case ; for the general notion of a Mediator, is one who has power and interest with God, effectually to recommend us to his favour ; and whether he mediates with, or without a Sacrifice, if his Mediation be powerful and efficacious, he is a true and proper Mediator ; and to set up such other Mediators besides Christ, must be injurious to his Mediation, for then Christ is not our only Mediator ; and after all the Apologies that can be made for it, it argues some distrust, either of Christ's Power, or good Will to help us, when we fly to other Patrons and Advocates.

2. And therefore *Monsieur de Meaux* has another Reserve ; for in the second place he tells us from the Council of *Trent*, *That to invoke Saints, according to the sense of this Council, is to have recourse to their Prayers, for obtaining benefits from God through Jesus Christ, so that in reality we do not obtain those benefits, which we receive by the Intercession of the Saints, otherwise than through Jesus Christ, and in his Name ; seeing these Saints themselves pray in no other manner than through Jesus Christ, and are not heard but in his Name. After which we cannot imagine, that any one should accuse us of forsaking Jesus Christ, when we beseech his Members, who are also ours, his Children, who are our Brethren, and his Saints, who are our first-fruits, to pray with us, and for us, to our common Master, in the name of our common Mediator.*

As for *forsaking Jesus Christ*, this we do not charge them with ; tho' whoever considers, how much more frequent addresses are made in the Church of *Rome* to the Virgin *Mary*, and some other powerful Saints, than to Christ himself, will be tempted to think, that it looks very like forsaking him ; but we only say, that they rob Christ of the glory of being our only Mediator and Advocate, by having recourse to the Prayers and Intercessions of so many Saints.

But how can the Intercession of Saints be injurious to the Mediation of Christ ; when they themselves interceed in the Name and Mediation of Christ ; which necessarily reserves to Christ
the

the glory of his Mediation entire, since the Saints themselves are not heard but in his Name ?

Now rightly to understand this, we must consider the Nature of Christ's Mediation, which is to offer up all those Prayers to God in Heaven, which we make to God in his Name on Earth. He is our Mediator in Heaven, *our High-Priest, who is passed into the Heavens; who is made not after the law of a Carnal Commandment, but after the power of an endless life, who is made higher than the Heavens, who is not entred into the Holy Place made with hands, which are the Figures of the true, but into Heaven it self, now to appear in the presence of God for us.* So that as the High-Priest under the Law entred once a year into the Holy Place, which was a type and figure of Heaven, to make expiation and intercessions for the People; so the Office of Christ, as our High-Priest and Mediator, is to ascend into Heaven with his own Blood, and there to appear in the presence of God for us. His Mediatory Office is confined to Heaven; there he presents our Prayers to God, in virtue of his own Blood; and this is as peculiar and appropriated to him, as it was to the High-Priest under the Law, to offer the Blood of the Sacrifice, and make Atonement, and Intercession in the Holy of Holies.

Heb. 4. 14.
Heb. 7. 16. 26.
Heb. 9. 24.

So that to present our Prayers to God in Heaven, is the peculiar Office of Christ, who is our great High-Priest, and only Mediator in the immediate presence of God in Heaven; and to apply our selves to any other Mediators in Heaven, to present our Prayers to God, in what manner, or upon what pretence soever it be, is injurious to the Mediation of Christ, whose proper Office it is to present our Prayers to God in Heaven. And that pretence that the Saints pray for us only in the Name and Mediation of Christ, is no Apology in this case, for in what Name soever they pray, they offer up our Prayers to God immediately in Heaven, which is the Office of our great High-Priest, for there is and must be but one Mediator in Heaven.

And if we consider, what is meant by Praying to God in the Name and Mediation of Christ, we shall see reason to think, that this is very improperly attributed to the Saints in Heaven. For when we pray to God in the Name of Christ, though we address our Prayers immediately to God, yet God does not receive them, as coming immediately from us, but as presented by the hands of our Mediator; which is the true meaning of Praying to God in the Name of Christ, that we offer our Prayers to God, not directly.

rectly from our selves, for then we should have no need of a Mediator, but by his Hands, whose Office it is to present them to God, to appear in the Presence of God for us, which is therefore called *coming to God by him*.

Heb. 7. 25.

Now this is very agreeable to the state and condition of Christians on Earth, who are at a great distance from the immediate Throne and Presence of God, to offer their Prayers by the hands of a Mediator, who appears in the presence of God for them; and the reason, why we want a Mediator to appear for us, is because we are not yet admitted into God's immediate Presence ourselves. But could every ordinary Priest, or *Jew*, have been admitted into the Holy of Holies, as the High-Priest was, they might as well have offered their Prayers and Sacrifices there immediately to God, without the Ministry and Mediation of the High-Priest; and those who are in Heaven in the immediate presence of God, if they offer up any Prayers to God for themselves or others, they offer them immediately and directly to God, because they offer them to God in his immediate Presence; which is the true notion of Christ's Mediation, that he appears in the presence of God for us: And therefore whatever use there may be of the Name of Christ in Heaven; Saints in Heaven, who live in the immediate Presence of God, have no need of a Mediator to offer their Prayers to God, as Saints on Earth have, because they are admitted to the immediate Vision of God themselves. To offer up our Prayers to God, in the Name and Mediation of Christ, supposes, that we are at a distance from God, and not admitted into his Presence to speak for our selves; but those Prayers, which are offered to God in his immediate Presence, need no Mediator to present them. And yet to say, that the Saints in Heaven offer their Prayers to God in the Name and Mediation of Christ, is to say, that when they are admitted to the immediate Presence of God themselves, they still need a Mediator; that the Prayers they offer to God, in his immediate Presence, they do not offer immediately to him, but by the hands of a Mediator; which if it be Sense, I am sure, is no good Divinity, as neither agreeing with the Types of the Law, nor with the Gospel-account of Christ's Mediation. And therefore if glorified Saints appear for us in the presence of God in Heaven, they are as much our Mediators as Christ is; for this is the most essential Character of this Mediation, that *he appears in the presence of God for us*. The only Objection I can fore-see against this, is, that some of the ancient Fathers, though they did not

not pray to Saints to pray for them, yet were inclined to believe, that Saints departed did pray for the Church on Earth, especially for their particular Friends, which they left behind them, and therefore to be sure did not think this any injury to the Mediation of Christ. But then we must consider, that as they spoke doubtfully of this matter, so those very Fathers did not believe, that Saints departed were received up into the highest Heavens, into the immediate Presence and Throne of God; though they thought them in a very happy state, yet not perfect, till the resurrection; and therefore they prayed for Saints departed, as well as believed, that Saints departed prayed for them. Now any Mediation and Intercession on this side Heaven, is very consistent with the Mediation of Christ in Heaven; but to intercede in Heaven is his peculiar Office, which no other Creature can share in, since his Resurrection and Ascension. This, I think, is sufficient to prove, that *Monsieur de Meaux* his Exposition cannot reconcile *Praying to Saints to Pray for us*, either with the peculiar Worship of God, or with the Glory and Dignity of our great and only Mediator and Advocate *Jesus Christ*.

The Character of a Papist Represented.

3. Of Addressing more Supplications to the Virgin Mary than to Christ. Pag. 4.

Monsieur de Meaux takes no notice of that peculiar kind of Worship, which is paid in the Church of Rome to the Virgin Mary, as being sensible how hard it is to reconcile this with his bare *Ora pro nobis*; but the Representer, who pretends to follow the Bishops Pattern, but wants his Judgment and Caution to manage it, undertakes to Apologize for this too; and it is worth the while to consider what he says.

The Papist Mis-represented is said to believe the Virgin Mary, to be much more powerful in Heaven than Christ, and that she can command him to do, what she thinks good, and for this reason he Honours her, much more then he does her Son, or God the Father, for one Prayer he says to God, saying ten to the Holy Virgin. Let us then consider how much of Mis-representation there is in this; And I shall begin with the last first, because mens Actions are the best Interpreters of their Thoughts and Belief.

The Papist for one Prayer he says to God, says ten to the Virgin Mary: Is this Mis-represented? Let him but tell over his Beads,
and

Contemplations on the life and glory of Holy Mary, p. 24.

and see how many *Ave Marias* and *Pater nosters* he will find upon a string, which are exactly ten for one. This he confesses, and thinks it as innocent to recite the Angelical Salutation now, as it was for the Angel *Gabriel* and *Elizabeth* to do it. But did the Angel use it as a Prayer to the Virgin *Mary*? Is *Hail thou that art Highly favoured, The Lord is with thee, blessed art thou amongst Women*, when spoken to the Virgin, who was then present to hear it, a friendly Salutation, or a Prayer? Was it delivering a Message, or an Act of Devotion? Or is this the *Ave Maria* now in use in the Church of *Rome*? As I remember, there are two or three little words, *Ora pro nobis*, added to it, which make it a Prayer, not the Angelical Salutation: and we do not read, that the Angel said, *Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us Sinners, now and in the hour of Death*.

Indeed, were it lawful to pray to the Virgin *Mary*, I should have less to say against the frequent repetition of this prayer; but yet a man might enquire, why the prayer to the Virgin *Mary* is repeated so much oftner than the prayer to God; is not this to honour her much more then he does her Son, or God the Father? For is not Prayer an act of Honour and Worship? And do we not then honour that Being most, to whom we pray ofteneft? No, says the Representer, for he does not at any time say even so much as one Prayer to her, but what is directed more principally to God. Surely there must be some Mystery in this. For do they not say a great many Prayers, immediately directed to the Virgin *Mary*, and not at all directed to God? Is not their *Ave Maria* such a Prayer, and do they principally pray to God in those Prayers, which are immediately directed to the Virgin *Mary*? When they pray to the Virgin *Mary*, to pray to them, is this Prayer principally directed to God Almighty? What when the Virgin is only named; And the matter of the Prayer is such, that it cannot be directed to God Almighty, unless they think it proper to pray to God to pray for them? Yes, these Prayers to the Virgin are offered up as a thankful Memorial of Christ's Incarnation, and an acknowledgment of the Blessedness of Jesus the fruit of her Womb. The meaning of which can be no more than this, That when they Pray to *Mary* the Mother of Jesus, it is a tacite acknowledgement, that Jesus was born of her, and that the Son must be a very Glorious Prince, when the Mother is so highly exalted upon account of her Relation to him, as to have so many devout Prayers and Hymns offered up to her. But does this prove,

prove, that the Prayers which are immediately directed to the Virgin Mary, are principally directed to Christ, because Mary was his Mother; which is the whole Mystery of the business. Suppose Christ should think himself honoured by those Prayers which are offered to his Mother, yet is there no difference between praying to Christ, and that honour we do him in praying to his Mother? A late Author indeed tells us, that the Veneration which we give to Mary, redounds to Jesus: *All Honour given to the Mother, tending to the Glory of the Son; for as he communicates with her in Flesh and Blood, so also doth he partake with her in her Qualities and Perfections, and therefore he is a sharer in that Homage and Observance that is made to her.* This is a new sort of Consubstantiation, and Communication of Properties; but yet how much soever we honour Jesus, when we pray to Mary, yet we do not pray to Jesus, when we pray to Mary; and therefore these Prayers are principally and immediately directed to Mary, not to God or Christ; and therefore to offer ten Prayers to Mary, for one to God, look very like honouring Mary much more than her Son, or God the Father. Ibid p. 5.

Well, but she is the Mother of God, and Blessed amongst Women; but how does her being Christ's Mother, entitle her to a greater share in our Prayers and Devotions, than Christ himself? It is indeed a great Honour to her to be the Mother of Jesus, but does this entitle her to that Worship and Homage which is due to her Son? She is the happiest Mother among Women, but does this advance her above Angels and Arch-Angels? For my part I see no reason to think, that her bearing Christ in her Womb, which was a singular Favour conferred on her, but has nothing of Merit in it, should advance her above the most eminent Apostles and Martyrs, who with undaunted Courage and unwearied Industry propagated the Gospel throughout the World, and were the great Ministers of his Kingdom: I am sure our Saviour does not seem to attribute any such mighty Virtue to the Maternity of Mary, when a certain Woman said unto him, *Blessed is the Womb that bare thee, and the Paps which thou hast sucked;* he answered, *Yea rather Blessed are they who hear the Word of God and keep it.* Luke 11. 27.
Matth. 12. 46.
&c. And in another place, when some told him, *Behold thy Mother and thy Brethren stand without desiring to speak with thee,* he answered and said unto him, *that told him, Who is my Mother? And who are my Brethren?* and he stretched forth his hand towards his Disciples, saying, *Behold my Mother and my Brethren, for whosoever shall do the Will of my Father, which is in Heaven, the same is my Mother and Sister,*

and Brother. Which prefers his meanest Disciples before the Mother of his Flesh, considered only as his Mother ; which he would not have done, had the bare Maternity of *Mary* advanced her above all other Creatures.

Well, but *she is most acceptable to God in her Intercession for us.* Did the Angel tell them this too, as well as that she is Blessed among Women ? Whence then do they learn it ? Is it only because she is a Mother ? Have all Mothers then such a natural Authority over their Sons, even when they are Sovereign Princes ? Cannot the Eternal Son of God chuse an Earthly Mother, but he must admit her into the Throne with him, and govern his Kingdom, if not by her commands, yet by her Importunities and Requests ? This is thought a great weakness in Earthly Princes, and usually proves fatal to their Government ; and yet it is much more tolerable in Earth than in Heaven. What has the Mother of his Flesh to do, to intermeddle in the affairs of his Spiritual Kingdom, which she is not capable of managing ? She had no Authority in the Church, while she was on Earth, which methinks her Maternity might give her as much right to, as to be Queen-Regent of Heaven. When Christ was a child he lived in subjection to *Mary* and *Joseph*, though he began early to give them a Specimen of a Superior Power he had, and such a work to do, as discharged him from subjection to Earthly Parents. When he was but twelve years old, he told his Mother, *How was it, that ye sought me, wist ye not that I must be about my Fathers business ?* When his Mother at the Marriage in *Cana* of *Galilee* acquainted him, that their Wine was spent, and insinuated her desire, that he should help them, he rebukes her for it, *Woman, what have I to do with thee ? my hour is not yet come.* She was not to direct him, what to do in such matters ; and can we think then, that now he is advanced to the right hand of God, he will suffer her to intermeddle in the administration of his Kingdom.

Luke 2. 48.
49.

John 2. 3, 4.

But our Author believes it damnable, to think the Virgin *Mary* more powerful in Heaven than Christ, or that she can in any thing command him. It is well the *Impera Redemptori*, command the Redeemer, is at last disowned by them, though it may be some may think it a little too much to call it damnable, because whatever Papists believe now, there was a time when this was used in the Missals of the Roman Church ; and will he say, that it was damnable then to use that Hymn ?

I believe no Papist ever thought the Virgin *Mary* to be Omnipotent,

potent, much less, that she can do more than Christ can, or can command him by a direct and superior Authority; nor did any man, that I know of, ever charge them with this: and if it be only in this sense, that he denies the Virgin to be more powerful in Heaven than Christ, it is nothing to the purpose; for it is possible for a Subject to be more powerful than his Prince, tho' he cannot command him, and can do nothing but by his Princes favour; but if he have so much the ascendant of his Prince, that he can deny him nothing, that he does whatever he will have him, and such things as no other consideration should incline him to do, but the desire of such a powerful Favourite; this man is really more powerful than the Prince, because he has the direction and government of the Princes Power: He has the Prince himself in his power, and therefore is more powerful than he. And if this be the case of the Blessed Virgin, that she has the disposal of Christ's Grace and Mercy, though not by a direct Authority, yet by her Interest in her Son, if he never denies that which she asks, but grants that at her Intercession, which he would not grant without it; if the Papists believe this, they believe her to be more powerful than Christ, and they have then good reason, as they do, to put up more frequent Prayers to her, than to God or Christ himself. And whether they do not believe this, and that at this very day, let any one judge, from these passages in *the Contemplations of the Life and Glory of the Holy Mary*, which is lately published in English, *Permissu Superiorum*. " There, p. 7. he tells us, that God hath by a solemn Covenant pronounced *Mary* to be the Treasury of Wisdom, Grace, and Sanctity under Jesus. So that whatever Gifts are bestowed upon us by Jesus, we receive them by the Mediation of *Mary*: No one being gracious to Jesus, who is not devoted to *Mary*, nor hath any one been specially confident of the Patronage of *Mary*, who hath not through her received a special Blessing from Jesus. Whence it is one great mark of the Predestination of the Elect, to be singularly devoted to *Mary*, since she hath a full Power, as a Mother, to obtain of Jesus, whatever he can ask of God the Father, and is comprehended within the Sphere of Man's Predestination to Glory, Redemption from Sin, and Regeneration by Grace. Neither hath any one petitioned *Mary*, who was refused by Jesus, nor trusted in *Mary*, and was abandoned by Jesus.

Pag 7.

" A little after he directs the Devotes of the Virgin to have
 " a firm and unshaken confidence in her Patronage, amidst the
 " greatest of our inward Conflicts with Sensuality, and out-
 " ward Tribulations from the adverse Casualties of this Life ;
 " through a strong Judgment of her eminent Power, within
 " the Empire of Jesus, grounded upon the singular Prerogative
 " of her Divine Maternity ; for by vertue thereof no State of
 " man can be so unhappy, through the malice of Satan, the
 " heats of our Passions, or the Enormity of Sin, which exceeds
 " her Love towards the Disciples of Jesus, or the efficacy of her
 " Mediation for us unto Jesus : So that though the condition
 " of some great sinners may be so deplorable, that all the limi-
 " ted Excellency, Merits and Power of all the Saints and An-
 " gels cannot effectually bend the Mercies of Jesus to receive
 " them, yet such is the acceptableness of the Mother of Jesus to
 " Jesus, that whoever is under the Verge of her Protection, may
 " confide in her Intercessions to Jesus : He denying no Favour
 " to her, whereby the Wonders of Man's Predestination and
 " Redemption through Jesus, may be magnified and promoted.
 So that the Blessed Virgin is more powerful than all the Saints
 and Angels in Heaven ; she has all the Power of Christ, all his
 Grace and Mercy in her hands, and can dispense it to such sin-
 ners, whom Christ would not pity and relieve without her, and
 therefore is a more powerful Patroness of sinners, than Christ
 himself is. And therefore he might well add in the next place,
 that all these Blessings flow from Jesus to all through Mary, and may
 therefore justly refer them all to her, as to the most effectual Instru-
 ment, Channel, and Conveyance of all. Now if this be true Re-
 presenting, it is no Misrepresentation to say, that a Papist be-
 lieves the Virgin Mary to be much more powerful in Heaven than
 Christ ; not that she has any power of her own, but that she
 can more powerfully and effectually bend the Mercies of Jesus to re-
 lieve sinners, than the Mercies of Jesus can bend themselves without
 her.

SECT. V.

IMAGES.

THAT the Worship of Images, as it was practised by the Heathens, is Idolatry, Monsieur *de Meaux* and the Representer suppose; and therefore their Business is, to give such an account of the Worship of Images, as practised in the Church of *Rome*, as to distinguish themselves from Heathen Idolaters. To this purpose the Bishop tells us, *The Council of Trent forbids us expressly to believe any Divinity or Virtue in them, for which they ought to be revered, to demand any favour of them, or to put any trust in them; and ordains, That all the Honour which is given to them, should be referred to the Saints themselves which are represented by them. That the Honour we render Images, is grounded upon their exciting in us the remembrance of those they represent. That by bumbling our selves before the Image of Christ crucified, we shew what is our submission to our Saviour. So that to speak precisely, and according to the Ecclesiastical Stile, when we honour the Image of an Apostle or Martyr, our intention is not so much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apostle or Martyr in the presence of the Image. Thus the Pontifical tells us, and the Council of Trent expresses the same thing, when it says, The Honour we render to Images, has such a reference to those they represent, that by the means of those Images which we kiss, and before which we kneel, we adore Jesus Christ, and honour the Saints, whose Types they are. To the same purpose the Representer speaks, and almost in the same words. So that the sum of their Apology is this, That they do not believe Images to have any Divinity in them, or to be Gods, and therefore do not pray to, nor put their trust in the Image, nor so much honour the Image in those external Expressions of Reverence they pay to it, by kissing it, and kneeling before it, as Christ, or the Saint whom the Image represents; and the usefulness of Images to excite in us the remembrance of those whom*

we.

we love and honour, is a justifiable Reason of that Honour we pay to them.

This is a matter of very great consequence, and deserves to be carefully stated ; and therefore I shall strictly examine, Whether this Exposition will justify the Worship of Images, and sufficiently distinguish the Worship of the *Church of Rome*, from that Worship which the *Heathens* gave to their Images.

Monsieur *de Meaux* pretends, by his Exposition of the Doctrines of the Church of *Rome*, to cut off Objections and Disputes ; that is, so to state the matter, that there may be no place for those Objections which Protestants commonly urge against worshipping Images. But I do not see, that he has made any Essay of this nature in the point of Image-Worship, but has left both all the Disputes among themselves, and with Protestants, untouched.

The Objections which Protestants urge against the Worship of Images, as taught and practised in the Church of *Rome*, are principally these four.

1. That it is expressly forbid by the second Commandment, without any limitation or exception.
2. That the Heathens are in Scripture charged with Idolatry in the Worship of Images.
3. That it is a violation of the Divine Majesty, *Crimen læsæ Majestatis*, to represent God by a material and senseless Image or Picture.
4. That a visible Object of Worship, though considered only as a Representation, is expressly contrary to the Law of *Moses*, and especially to the spiritual Nature of the Christian Worship.

Now I do not see, how the Bishop's Exposition takes off any of these Objections, which after all that he hath said, are in full force still, as I shall particularly shew.

1. Then he tells us, *That the Council of Trent forbids us expressly to believe any Divinity or Virtue in Images, for which they ought to be revered.* We grant, the Council does forbid this ; and he knows that we never charge them with it, though there are some Practices of the Church of *Rome*, which look very suspiciously that way : But then we say, the second Commandment forbids the Worship of all Images, without

without any such limitation ; for there is not any one word in the Commandment to limit the prohibition of worshipping Images, to such Images, as are believ'd to have any Divinity in them. The words of the Commandment are as general as can be, *Thou shalt not make to thy self any Graven Image, nor the likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above, or in the Earth beneath, or in the Water under the Earth ; thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them.* The Commandment takes no notice of any Divinity which is supposed to be in these Images, but only of the Representation made by them, that they are the Likeness or Representation of things in Heaven, or things on Earth, or things under the Earth ; and therefore the whole Dispute between Papists and Protestants about the sense of the second Commandment, and the strict notion of an Idol, is left untouch'd by this Exposition.

The Roman Doctors indeed tell us, that the Heathens worshipped their Images as Gods, and did ascribe Divinity to them ; upon which account Montieur *de Meaux* tells us, *All* Pag. 9. *these words of the Council are like so many Characters to distinguish us from Idolaters ; seeing we are so far from believing with them any Divinity annexed to the Images, that we do not attribute to them any Virtue, but that of exciting in us the remembrance of those they represent.* But he knew very well, that Protestants deny, that the Heathens took their Images for Gods any more than Papists do ; their Philosophers despised the charge, and made the same Apologies for themselves, which the Divines of the Church of *Rome* now do ; and we may suppose that common Heathens had much such apprehensions about them, as common Papists have : Those who had any sense, could not believe them to be Gods ; and those who have none, may believe any thing : but there is no great regard to be had to such mens Faith, whatever their Religion be, who are void of common sense. However, this Dispute, whether the Heathens did believe their Images to be Gods, or to have any more Divinity in them, than Papists attribute to their Images, is a Dispute still, and Monsieur *de Meaux* has not said one word to prevent it ; and therefore the condemnation of the Heathens for worshipping Images is still a good Objection against the worship of Images in the Church of *Rome*, till he prove

as well as assert this difference between them.

But indeed, tho' I readily grant that the Church of Rome does not believe that there is any Divinity in their Images, and that the Heathens did believe that Consecration brought down the Gods, whom they worshipped by such Representations, and tyed them by some invisible Charms to their Image, that they might be always present there to receive their Worship; yet this makes no material difference in their Notion of Images.

The reason why the Heathens thought it necessary by some Magical Arts to fasten their Gods, or some Divine Powers to their Images, was not to incorporate them with their Images, but to secure a Divine Presence there, to hear their Prayers, and receive their Sacrifices, without which all their Devotions paid to an Image were lost; which was very necessary, especially in the Worship of their Inferior Demons, whom they did not believe to be present in all places.

1 King. 18 27. As *Elijah* mocked the Priests of *Baal*, and said, Cry aloud; for he is a God: either he is talking, or he is pursuing, or he is in a Journey, or peradventure he sleepeth, and must be awaked. But now, those who believe that God is every-where present to see and hear what we do; and that the Saints, who are not present in their Images, yet do certainly know (by what means soever it be) what Prayers and Homages are offered to them at their Images, need not call down any Divine Powers constantly to attend their Images, but only to procure their acceptance of those Devotions which are paid to them at their Images. And this is the difference between the Consecration of Heathen and Popish Images: The first is to procure the Presence of their Gods in their Images; the other to obtain the Favour of Christ, and the Saints, to accept those Prayers and Oblations, and other Acts of Devotion which are offered to them at their Images; as to give but one Instance of it in a Prayer used at the Consecration of the Cross.

Pontif. in Bened. nov. crucis.

Sanctificetur lignum istud in nomine Patris & Filii, & Spiritus Sancti, & benedictio illius ligni in quo membra sancta saluatoris suspensa sunt, sit in isto ligno; ut videntes inclinantesq; se propter Deum ante istam crucem inveniant Corporis & Animæ sanitatem. Let this Wood be sanctified in the

name

Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost ; and let the Blessing of that Wood, on which the holy Members of our Saviour hung, be on this Wood ; that those, who pray and bow themselves before this Cross, may obtain Health both of Body and Soul.

This peculiar Virtue which Consecration bestows on Images to obtain the Favour of Christ and his Saints, to those who pray and worship before them, is all that the Heathens intended in calling down their Gods to attend their Images to hear and receive their Prayers and Sacrifices. They did not believe their Images to be Gods, but Silver, or Gold, Wood, or Brass, or Stone, according to the Materials they were made of, as the Church of *Rome* does ; but they thought their Gods were present to hear the Prayers they made before their Images ; as the Church of *Rome* also believes, that Christ and his Saints have a peculiar regard to those Prayers which are made before their Images, as is evident from their Forms of Consecrating Images to such an use. The Heathens did not put their trust in an Image of Wood and Stone, but in that God, who was represented by that Image, and was there present to help them. And thus, tho' the Church of *Rome* does not demand any Favour of Images, nor put any Trust in them, yet she expects the Relief and Acceptance of Christ and the Saints for that Worship she pays to their Images ; and I would desire any Man to shew me the difference between these two, especially when we consider how much greater Virtue is attributed to some Images of the Blessed Virgin in the Church of *Rome*, than there is to others ; as to the Image of the Lady of *Loretto*, &c. which can signify nothing less, than that the Virgin is more pleased with, and will more graciously accept our Worship before such an Image, than any other ; or else methinks the Devotoes of the Virgin should not go so many Miles in Pilgrimage to the Lady of *Loretto*, as they often do, if they believed the Images of the Virgin which they had at home to be of equal Power : which is as much trusting in Images, and attributing a Divine Virtue to them, as ever the Heathens were guilty of. For methinks those who strictly adhere to the Letter of Scripture, to prove that the Heathens believed their Images to be Gods, and did put their Trust in them, because the Scrip-
I
pture

Psalm 135. 15,
16, 17.

pture expressly says so, should consider also, that the Scripture expressly tells us, *that the Idols of the Heathens are Silver and Gold, the Work of mens hands ; they have Mouths, but they speak not ; Eyes have they, but they see not ; they have Ears, but they hear not, neither is there any Breath in their Mouths :* and therefore we have as much reason to conclude, that the Heathens did not put their Trust in the material Images, which they knew to be no better than stupid senseless matter, which could not of themselves hear or help them, as to confess, that in some sense they made Gods of them. For if the Heathens did not believe them to be dead senseless Images, which could neither speak, nor see, nor hear, but that they were really animated by invisible Spirits ; they were not such dull and sottish Idolaters, as the Psalmist represents them ; and if they did (as the Psalmist takes it for granted they themselves acknowledged) then it is certain they could not believe the material Images to be Gods, nor the Objects of their Hope and Trust, and therefore might (as some of their Philosophers in effect did) as safely renounce believing any Divinity or Vertue in their Images, *for which they ought to be revered, or demanding any Favour of them, or putting any Trust in them,* as the Council of Trent does. So that their not believing any Divinity in their Images, does neither excuse them from the Breach of the Second Commandment, nor sufficiently distinguish the Church of Rome's worshipping Images, from that Worship which the Heathens gave them ; at least the Bishop has said nothing to answer or prevent these Objections against Image-Worship, which he pretends to be the design of his Exposition.

2. As a fuller Explication of the Doctrine of the Church about Image-Worship, Monsieur de Meaux adds, that the Council of Trent ordains, *That all the Honour which is given to them (Images) should be referred to the Saints themselves, which are represented by them :* Or, as the Council expresses it, *The Honour we render to Images has such a reference to those they represent, (ad Prototypa quæ illæ representant, to the Prototypes which they represent) that by the means of those Images (per Imagines, by those Images) we kiss, and before which we kneel, we adore Jesus Christ, and honour the Saints, whose Types they are.*

Quorum

Quorum illæ similitudinem gerunt ; Whose likenesſ they are, or whom they represent.

Hitherto we have no Exposition at all of the Doctrine of the Church about Image Worship, but only a bare relation what the Council ſays, that Images muſt be worſhipped only upon account of their Representation ; and that the Worſhip which is given to the Image, is referred to the Prototype : This all Roman-Catholicks agree in ; but yet there is an endleſs Diſpute among them, about the Nature and Degree of this Worſhip, and it will be neceſſary to take a ſhort view of it.

They are all agreed, that at leaſt the external Acts of Adoration are to be paid to Images, ſuch as Kiſſing, Kneeling, Bowing, Proſtration, Incenſe ; this *Durandus*, and *Holcot*, and *Picus Mirandula* allowed ; they all agreed, that the Worſhip which was given to Images, is upon account of Representation, or as Chriſt and his Saints are represented by them, and worſhipped in that Worſhip, which is given to their Images ; but then there was a threefold difference between them.

1. That ſome would not allow this Worſhip in a proper ſenſe to be given to the Images, but *improperly* and *abufively* ; becauſe at the preſence of the Image, which excites in us the remembrance of the Object, we worſhip the Object represented by it, Chriſt or his Saints, as if they were actually preſent ; this was the Opinion of *Durandus*, *Holcot*, and *Picus Mirandula*, who could hardly eſcape the cenſure of Hereſie for it ; and that which excuſed them, as *Vasquez* *Vasquez* Diſp. ſays, was, That they agreed with the Catholick Church in 106. C. 1. performing all external Acts of Adoration to Images, and that they differed only in manner of ſpeaking from the reſt.

2. *Thomas Aquinas*, and his Followers, and ſeveral great Divines ſince the Council of *Trent*, teach, That the ſame Worſhip is to be given to the Image, which is due to the Prototype ; and therefore as Chriſt muſt be worſhipped with *Latria*, or a Supream Worſhip, ſo muſt the Image of Chriſt, becauſe the Image is worſhipped only on account of its Representation, and therefore muſt be worſhipped with

the same Worship with the thing represented : and the motion of the Mind to an Image, as an Image, is the same with the motion to the Thing represented. Which seems the most reasonable Account ; for if I worship Christ by his Image, I must give that Worship to the Image which I intend for Christ, because in that case the Image is in Christ's place and stead to me.

3. The third Opinion is, That though we must worship Images, yet we must not give the Worship of *Latria* to them, no not to the Image of Christ himself, but an inferior degree of Worship. This some Divines asserted on the Authority of the Council of *Nice*, which expressly determined, that *Latria* is not to be given to Images. But this is the most absurd Opinion of all ; for if we must worship Images only upon the account of their Representation, we must give that Worship to them, which is due to the thing represented by them ; and if we give any other Worship to them, we must worship them for their own sakes. And what is that Worship which is due to them as separated from the Prototype ? What Worship is due to carved and polished Brass and Stone ? Whoever desires to see these three different Opinions, with the proper Reasons of them, explained more at large, may consult Dr. *Stillingfleet's* Learned Defence of his Discourse of Idolatry, *Part 2. Chap. 1. Page 575, &c.* Now the Council of *Trent* only determines, that the Honour we give to Images, must be referred to the Prototypes, that we must adore Christ and his Saints in that Worship which we give to their Images : which seems to countenance the second Opinion, That the Worship of *Latria* is to be given to the Image of Christ, because that is the Worship which we must give to Christ : But then the Council refers to the second Council of *Nice* ; which determines the quite contrary ; and I dare not undertake to reconcile the Council with itself, since the Fathers of that Council would not plainly decide this Controversie among their Divines.

Let us then try, if we can discover, what Monsieur *de Meaux*, thinks of this Matter, what Worship that is which he allows to be given to Images.

Now,

Now, as far as I can guess, he is of *Durandus's* Opinion, That all External Acts of Adoration are to be performed before the Image, but that the Image is not to be properly worshipped, but only Christ in the presence of his Image, as representing his Person to us, and exciting in us the remembrance of him. Thus he tells us, *That while the Image* Pag. 9.
of Christ crucified, being present before our Eyes, causes so precious a remembrance in our Souls, we are moved to testify by some exterior signs, how far our gratitude bears us; and by humbling our selves before the Image, we shew what is our submission to our Saviour. So that he allows of *humbling our selves before the Image*, that is, of paying the External Acts of Worship before it. Well! but is this to worship the Image? For that he tells us, *to speak properly, and according to the Ecclesiastical Stile*, (I suppose he means a new Modern Stile, for the old Ecclesiastical Stile did somewhat differ) *when we honour the Image of an Apostle or Martyr, our intention is not so much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apostle or Martyr in the presence of the Image: that is, this is not properly, but improperly and abusively called the Worship or Honour of the Image: but Christ, or his Saints, are properly worshipped before, or in presence of their Images, as representing them to us; which was exactly the Opinion of Durandus.*

This certainly is the least that can be made of the Worship of Images; and yet as far removed as this Opinion seems to be from the Opinion of *St. Thomas*, who affirms, that the Worship of *Latria* is to be given to the Image of Christ; I take them to be the very same, though very differently expressed. The right stating of this, will mightily tend to clear this perplexed Controversie; and therefore I shall do it with all the plainness I can.

1. Then I observe, that to pay the external Acts of Adoration *to, or before, or in presence of* a representative Object as representing, signifies the very same thing; it is all one kind of Worship, because the formal Reason is the same in all; and that is, the Representation. When I bow to the Image of Christ, I bow to it as representing Christ to me, who is the ultimate Object of my Worship; when I bow

bow before, or in the presence of the Image, I do the same thing, tho' I give it a new Name ; I bow before it, as representing Christ to me, as if he himself were there personally present in the Image. When I bow to the Image, I do not bow to the Wood or Stone, but to Christ as represented in the Image : when I bow to Christ before the Image, I do the same thing, I bow to Christ as represented in the Image which stands before me. For suppose Christ were there present instead of the Image, would it make any difference in my Worship, to say, That I bow to Christ, or before him, or in his presence, when they all signifie, that I direct my Worship to him as personally present ; no more difference is there in bowing to, or before, or in the presence of the Image, when I direct my Worship to Christ as represented by the Image. There may indeed be a great difference between bowing to my Prince, and in the presence of my Prince, when these Expressions signifie different Objects : for I may bow to another man *in the presence* of my Prince, and in that Act I do not bow *to* my Prince ; but when *to*, and *before*, and *in presence*, do not distinguish the Objects, the Act is the same : If the presence of the Image were an accidental thing, and had no relation to that Worship which we pay to Christ or the Saints, where such Images are present, there would be a great difference between bowing *to*, and *in presence* of the Image ; but if these Images be on purpose set up in Consecrated Places, and are themselves Consecrated for that use, to represent Christ and the Saints to us ; whether we say we bow to them, or before them, we do the same thing, and with the same intention, to worship Christ and his Saints as represented by them. So that if we own, as the Bishop does, that the Honour done before the Image, goes to the Prototype, to Christ, or the Saints represented by such Images, we need not dispute about the manner of expressing it ; he may take his own way of speaking, that he honours Christ in the presence of his Image, so he honours Christ as represented by the Image ; and therefore, in Scripture, to fall down before and to the Image, and to worship the Image, are all equivalent Expressions.

There

There is indeed a vast difference between bowing to, or before an Image, which represents God, or Christ, or some Divine Being to us, as the Object of our Worship; and bowing towards a Place, or worshipping God towards a Place, as the Jews worshipped towards the Temple, and in the Temple towards the Mercy-Seat; the one was absolutely forbid by the Jewish Law, the other allowed and practised by the devoutest Worshippers of God: which argues, that there is some difference between them; and it is not hard to say, wherein the difference consists, that one is a representative Object, the other only a Circumstance of Worship. To bow to, or before an Image, is to worship the Image, or God or Christ by the Image, which makes the Image as representing the Prototype, the Object of our Worship; but which way soever we look or bow, towards the *East*, or towards the *West*, God alone is the immediate Object of our Worship, the Place only the Circumstance of Worship; whenever we bow to God, we must bow towards some Place or other: but the Place does not represent God to us as an Image does, and therefore is no Object of Worship: which shews what little reason the Protestor had to compare *bowing to the Altar*, and *kneeling to the Sacrament*, as he calls it, with bowing to an Image. There is no Man of the Church of *England*, that I know of, who bows to the Altar; I am sure the Church no where teaches any such Practice. She only recommends to her Children bowing of the Body to God, when they come in and go out of his House; and though the Communion-Table, or Altar, is generally so situated at the *East* end of the Church, as to be opposite to the entrance of it; for which reason some have called it, *bowing towards the Altar*; yet our Church teaches us to have no regard at all to it. And Archbishop *Laud*, in his Speech in the *Star-Chamber*, declares, That if there were no Table standing, he would worship God when he came into his House: So that there is no need to find any Hole, as the Protestor speaks, to get out at with the Altar, for that was never in yet, as far as this Controversie is concerned; and therefore I am like to make no breach for him to follow at with his Image. Nor does any Man kneel to the Sacrament, but only receive

See Dr. Stil-
lingfl. Defence
of the Disc. of
Idol. p. 703,
&c. And se-
veral Conferen-
ces between a
Romish Priest,
&c. p. 211, &c.

receive the Sacrament kneeling ; and if he cannot distinguish between an Act of Worship to the Sacrament, and a devout posture of receiving it ; yet the meanest Son of the Church of *England* can. Why does he not as well say, that when we kneel at Prayers, we worship the Common-Prayer-Book which lies before us, and out of which we read, as that we worship the Bread, when we receive and eat it with devout Passions upon our Knees.

But to return to the Exposition.

2. I observe, that there is a great difference between a memorative Sign, and the Representation of an Image : both of them indeed excite in us the remembrance of something, but in such different manner, as quite alter the nature of them. It is necessary to take notice of this, because I find Monsieur *de Meaux*, and after him the Representers, very much to equivocate in this matter : it is a very innocent thing to worship God or Christ, when any natural or instituted Sign brings them to our minds, even in the presence of such a Sign : As if a Man upon viewing the Heavens, and the Earth, and the Creatures that are in it, should raise his Soul to God, and adore the great Creator of the World ; or upon the accidental sight of a natural Cross, should call to mind the Love of his Lord, who died for him, and bow his Soul to him in the most submissive Adorations ; because, I say, this is very innocent, the Bishop would persuade his Readers, that this is the only use they make of Images, to excite in us the remembrance of those they represent ; and mightily wonders at the little justice of those, who treat with the term of Idolatry, that religious Sentiment, which moves them to uncover their Heads, or bow them before the Image of the Cross, in remembrance of him who was crucified for the Love of us. And that it is sufficient to distinguish them from the Heathen Idolaters, That they declare, that they will not make use of Images, but to raise the mind towards Heaven, to the end that they may there honour Jesus Christ or his Saints, and in the Saints God himself, who is the Author of all Sanctity and Grace.

Now it is certain, an Image will call to our remembrance the Person it represents, as the presence of the Person himself will make us remember him ; but this vastly differs from

a meer memorative Sign. - For the use of Images in the Church of *Rome*, is not primarily for Remembrance, but for Worship, as the Council of *Trent* expressly teaches. *That the Images of Christ, and the Virgin the Mother of God, and other Saints, are especially to be had and kept in Churches, and due Honour and Veneration to be given to them——because the Honour given to them, is referred to the Prototypes, which they represent ; so that by the Images, which we kiss, and before which we uncover our Heads, and prostrate our selves, we adore Christ, and venerate the Saints, whose likenesses they bear.* These are the words of the Council, and it would be a very odd Comment upon such a Text to say, that Images serve only for Remembrance.

A meer sign, which only calls Christ to our Minds, can deserve no Honour or Worship ; but a representing Sign, which puts us in mind of Christ by representing his Person to us, as if he were present, whether it raises our hearts to him in Heaven or not, yet according to the Council of *Trent*, it must direct our Worship to him, as represented in his Image. When men go to Church to worship *Christ*, or the Virgin *Mary*, before their Images, it may be presumed they think of them before they see their Images, and therefore do not go to be put in remembrance of them by their Images, but to worship them before the Images, in that Worship which they give to the Images. And therefore when the Bishop speaks so often of the Virtue of Images to excite in us the remembrance of the Persons they represent, to reconcile him with himself, and with the Council of *Trent*, which he pretends to own, we must not understand him as if Images were of no use but to be helps to memory, and are honoured for no other reason, (which is no reason at all) as the unwary Reader will be apt to mistake him ; but that these visible Images represent to us the invisible Objects of our Worship, and give us such a sense of their Power and Presence, as makes us fall down and worship them before those Representations, which we honour for their sakes ; that is, tho' they serve for remembrance, yet not as meer memorative Signs, but as memorative or representative Objects of Worship.

3. I observe, that it is the very same thing whether we say, that we worship Christ as represented by the Image, or worship the Image as representing Christ, for they both signify that Christ is worshipped in and by his Image, that the Honour and Worship is given to the Image, and referr'd to the Prototype. If Christ be worshipped as represented by the Image, then the Worship which is intended for Christ is given to the Image in his Name, and as his Representative; if the Image be worshipped as representing Christ, then the Worship which is given to the Image, is not for itself, but for Christ, whom it represents; which differ just as much as a Viceroy's being honoured for the King, or the King's being honoured in his Viceroy. And therefore I wonder, that any Man of Understanding and Judgment, as *Monsieur de Meaux* certainly is, should think there is any great matter in saying, *When we honour the Image of an Apostle or Martyr, our intention is not so much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apostle or Martyr in the presence of the Image*; that is, in and by the Image, as I have shewed that Phrase signifies, when it is referred to a Representative Object; for it is the very same thing to say, we honour the Image as representing the Martyr, or we honour the Martyr as represented by the Image.

Having premised these things, let us now compare the Opinion of *Monsieur de Meaux*, with the Opinion of *St. Thomas Aquinas* about the Worship of Images; and tho' the first is thought by some Men to say a great deal too little, and the other a great deal too much; yet it will appear, that their Opinions in this matter are the very same.

They both agree, That Christ and his Saints are represented by their Images; they both agree, that Christ and his Saints are worshipped in their Images, as represented by them; they both agree, that no other Worship is to be paid to, or before, or in presence of the Image, but only that Worship which is due to the *Prototype*, to Christ or his Saints represented by such Images: Hence *Thomas* asserts, that the Image is to be worshipped with that Worship which is due to the Prototype; the Image of Christ with *Latria*, because that is due to Christ; and the Images of the Saints with

Dulia,

Dulia, because that degree of Worship is proper to them ; and the Bishop teaches, *That when they honour the Image of an Apostle or Martyr, their intention is not so much to honour the Image, as to honour the Apostle or Martyr in presence of the Image :* that is, they perform no other Act of Worship in the presence of the Images, but that which is proper to the Apostle and Martyr ; and therefore they both agree, that there is but one motion of the Mind to the Image, and to the Prototype represented by it ; that is, as the Bishop speaks, they have but one intention, and that is to honour the Apostle or Martyr in the presence of the Image : and yet after all, they seem vastly to differ ; for *Thomas* says, that they give the Worship of the Prototype to its Image ; that is, that they worship the Image of Christ with *Latria*, which is the Worship due to Christ ; but the Bishop will not own, that they properly give any Worship at all to Images, but only worship Christ ; or the Saints in the presence of the Images : Christ indeed with *Latria*, and the Saints with *Dulia*, but their Images properly with neither : and yet this difference is only in words, as *Vasquez* confesses concerning *Durandus* and *Holcot*, whom *Mr. de Meaux* follows, *That they agreed with the Catholick Church, in performing all external Acts of Adoration to Images ; and that they differed only in manner of speaking from the rest.*

For, as I have already shew'd, to worship the Image, or before, and in the presence of the Image, when it signifies a Representative Object, is the same thing ; and there is no difference between worshipping the Image as representing Christ, and worshipping Christ as represented by the Image ; and yet this is all the difference between *Mr. de Meaux* and *Thomas Aquinas* : Tho' I think *Thomas* speaks most properly ; for if Christ be worshipped in his Image, we must give the Worship to the Image, which we intended for Christ, because Christ is worshipped in that Worship we give to his Image ; and therefore he cannot be worshipped by his Image, if his Image be not worshipped ; of which more presently.

Durandus indeed, whose Opinion *Mr. de Meaux* seems to follow, did in words oppose the Doctrine of *Thomas*, that the Worship of the Prototype ought not to be given to an

Image, because the Image and the Prototype were two distinct things ; and therefore what belonged to the Exemplar could not be attributed to an Image, however considered as an Image ; and so the Worship due to the Exemplar could not be given to the Image : but yet he plainly grants all that Thomas intended by it ; that the Image may be said to be worshipped with the same Worship with the thing represented ; because at the presence of the Image, we worship the Object represented by it, as if he were actually present.

But I have a better reason than this to believe that they were both of a Mind, tho' they expressed themselves very differently ; and that is, because their Arguments, whereby they confirm their several Opinions are the same, and then it is not likely that their Opinions should much differ.

Durand. in
Sent. 3. Dist. 9.
q. 2.

Durandus proves, That the Images are not to be worshipped, but only improperly and abusively ; because at their presence we call to mind those Objects represented by them, which are worshipped before the Images, as if they were present, by such Arguments as these : that Worship properly belongs only to that Being in whom the cause of Worship is, and that only to his Person, upon account of his adorable Perfections, which are the cause of that Worship ; and therefore Latria, or Supream Worship can be due only to God, upon account of his Deity. But that which is no Subject capable of Holiness and Vertue, cannot in itself be the term of Adoration ; and therefore, proper Worship can never be due to the Image of Christ, or to his Cross ; for tho' Christ be represented by his Image, there is a real difference in the thing, and in the conception between the Image and the thing represented ; and therefore, properly speaking, the same Worship is never due to the Image, that is to the Object represented by it.

Thomas Aquinas on the other side proves, that the Image must be worshipped with that Worship which is due to the Prototype, or the thing represented by it, by much the same Arguments.

1. That no irrational Creature is capable of Worship, but with a respect to a rational Being, which answers to Durandus's reason, that Worship properly belongs only to that Being, in whom the cause of Worship is ; and that which is no Subject capable

capable of Holiness and Vertue (as no inanimate, or irrational Creature is, and therefore no Image) cannot in itself be the term of Adoration. From which it appears that they must agree, that no proper Worship can be given to Images. 2. *Because Images are to be worshipped upon account of their Representation; therefore they are to be worshipped with the same Worship of the thing represented.* 3. *Because the motion of the Mind towards an Image, as an Image, is the same with the motion towards the thing represented.* So that Thomas plainly allows, that the Image is not to be worshipped at all upon its own account, but only as it represents; and to worship the Image as it represents, is the very same act with worshipping the Object as represented by the Image; because the motion of the Mind towards an Image, as an Image, that is, as it represents, is the same with the motion towards the thing represented: That to worship an Image as representing Christ, is the same thing with worshipping Christ as represented by the Image; and therefore the same Worship which is due to Christ, must be given to his Image, as representing him; or to him as represented by the Image. So that according to Thomas's reasoning, there is no difference between his giving the Worship of Christ to his Image, as representing him, and Durandus's worshipping Christ before his Image, as represented by it, as if he were actually present. Thomas could not have quarrelled with Durandus, because he owns it is the same thing, tho' Durandus quarrels with Thomas.

And therefore Vasquez, who seems to understand the Doctrine of Thomas as well as any man, acknowledges that Durandus and Holcot differed only in manner of speaking from the rest; and freely declares his own Opinion to be, that an Image cannot be lawfully worshipped any other way than as in and by that the Exemplar is made the term and next material Object of Adoration. And he gives this Reason for it, *Because no inanimate thing is of itself capable of Worship; but an Image considered as an Image, but without the Exemplar, is an inanimate thing.* This is the Doctrine of Thomas according to Vasquez, which allows no more Worship to an Image, considered in itself, then Durandus does, and yet he says, *that it may be delivered*

Vasquez Disp.

106. C. 1.

Idem Disp.

108. C. 3.

C. 9.

Disp. 109. C. 1. delivered absolutely, that Images are to be worshipped with Latria, if by that be meant the same Worship, which is given to the Exemplar: And therefore Bellarmine tells us, That to give the Bellarm. de Cultu Imag. l. 2. Worship of Latria to the Image of Christ, as representing Christ, is to worship the Image but improperly, and per accidens; and this reconciles Thomas and Durandus, who grants that the Image may be said to be worshipped improperly and abusively, as in presence of the Image, the Object is worshipped represented by it, as if it were actually present.

Page 5.

As for Durandus's Argument against Thomas's Doctrine, that the Worship of the Prototype is to be given to the Image, That there is a real difference in the thing, and in the conception between the Image and the thing represented; and therefore, properly speaking, the same Worship is never due to the Image, that is to the Object represented by it. I think, if any Worship of Images were justifiable, this Argument were easily answered. For tho' there be a great difference indeed in the nature of things, between the Image and the Object, between Christ suppose, and his Image which represents him; yet in this case there is none in the Conception; for an Image when it receives our Worship in the place and stead of the Prototype, does not represent according to the usual nature of an Image by its likeness and similitude; for so both in the thing and in the Conception the Image differs from the Object it represents; but it represents as a Proxy and Substitute, who in the eye of the Law, is the same Person with him, whom he represents. Thus Thomas must understand the Representation of an Image; when he says, that it is the same motion of the Mind to the Image, and the exemplar represented by it; that is, that the Image is supposed to supply the place of Christ, and represent him present to us; and therefore we worship the Image as Christ's Representative with that Worship we would give to him were he actually present; this is not indeed the natural use of Images, nor is it natural to worship them, but this is the true

Greg. de Valent. de Idolol. l. 2. c. 7. Interpretation of Thomas's Doctrine; and therefore Gregorius de Valentia expressly tells us, That the Image is worshipped in Christ's stead. And Cardinal Cajetan says, That Christ himself is the reason of the Worship of the Image; and his being in the

the Image is the condition by which the reason of the Worship doth excite men to worship and terminate it : that is, Christ is in his Image, as a King is in his Viceroy, or any man in his legal Proxy. This is what *Suarez* meant by the *esse reale*, and *esse representativum* of the Prototype ; that tho' the Images does not contain Christ in the first sense in his own proper Person, yet it does in the second sense as his legal Proxy, and Representative. And this *Durandus* himself must acknowledge, if there be any sense in his words, *That at the presence of the Image, we worship the Object represented by it, as if he were actually present.* For why should he in the presence of the Image, worship Christ represented by it, as if he were actually present, unless he account the Image the Substitute and Representative of Christ, as if he were actually present ; and this, I think, reconciles that appearance of difference between *Thomas* and *Durandus*, occasioned by a Misapprehension of *Thomas's* Doctrine. *Durandus* owns the Worship of Christ in the presence of the Image, as he is represented in the Image, as if he were actually present ; which is *Mr. de Meaux's* Opinion also in this matter ; but he will not allow this, but only in an improper and abusive sense, to be the Worship of the Image, because the Image is not Christ, but both in the thing and in the conception is distinguished from him ; and therefore to worship the Image of Christ, would be to worship Wood or Stone, with the Worship of Christ : Whereas *Thomas* considers the Image not as to its external matter or form, upon which account he denies any Worship to be given to it, but as the Proxy and Representative of Christ ; and thus it is Christ represented in the Image, and not the material Image, which is worshipped ; which is the very same with *Durandus's* way of worshipping Christ as represented in the Image, in the presence of the material Image ; that is, he worships before the material Image, but worships only the Person of Christ, as represented by the Image.

But this will be better understood by considering the nature and capacity of a legal Proxy or Representative. Suppose *A* were to all intents and purposes a legal Proxy for *B*, to do, and to receive whatever *B* might do and receive

in his own Person; in this case *A* is not considered as *A*, in his own personal Capacity, but *A* is *B*, as his Proxy and Representative. Suppose now that *C* owes a Sum of Money, or a certain Homage to *B*, and pays it to *A* as *B*'s Proxy; that is, not as he is *A*, but *B*. When *C* worships *A* as representing the Person of *B*, he is properly said not to worship *A*, but *B*; because he worships *A* not as *A*, but as *A* is *B*, in his Representative Capacity. Now if you will suppose *A* to be the Image, and *B* to be Christ, this explains in what sense *Thomas* worships the Image for Christ, not as the Image is Wood or Stone, but as it is the Representative of Christ's Person. Now Suppose *D* should scruple paying the Worship of *B* to *A*, because *A* is a distinct Person from *B*, and has no right to the same Worship; and therefore should only worship *B* in the presence of *A*, as representing him; would not all the World see, that *D* and *C* meant and did the same thing, worshipped *A* as the Representative of *B*, tho' *D* is pleased to phrase it otherwise, and more improperly than *C* does; for the personal Capacity of *A* is not considered at all, when it is worshipped for *B*, but only his Representative Capacity; and this is the only difference between *Thomas* and *Durandus*. *Thomas* worships the Image in Christ's place and stead, as representing Christ, without considering its natural Capacity as an Image of Wood or Stone; as *C* worships *A* as *B*'s Proxy, without considering *A*'s personal Capacity. But *Durandus* worships Christ as represented by the Image (which is the same with the Image representing Christ) in the presence of the Image considered in its natural Capacity; as *D* worships *B* as represented by *A*, in the presence of *A*, considered in his personal Capacity; that is, he worships representative *A* in the presence of personal *A*, which is the same thing that *C* does, but is a more uncouth and absurd way of speaking.

Thus to proceed, When *C* worships *A* as *B*'s Proxy, in his name and stead, does he worship *A* or *B*? he worships *A* indeed, but considered as *B*; and therefore the Worship given to *A* in the name of *B*, is not the Worship of *A*, but of *B*; And will any man say that *A* and *B* are two Objects of Worship? when in this sense, *A* is *B*, and is considered only

only as *B*, that is, as *B*'s Proxy, and therefore *A* considered as *A*, in his own personal Capacity, is not worshipped at all, neither absolutely nor relatively, *per se*, nor *per accidens*; but if *A* be worshipped only as *B*, to say, that *A* is worshipped relatively, or *per accidens*, is to say that *B*, who is worshipped in *A*, is worshipped both absolutely and relatively, properly and improperly, *per se* and *per accidens*; which are some of the Objections which *Catharinus* and others use against *Thomas*.

Much at the same rate others compare *Thomas*'s Doctrine of worshipping the Image with the Worship of the Prototype, as represented by it, with worshipping a Sign, and the Thing signified; or worshipping the King and his Robes, which are very remote from the Business, and perplex and confound a Doctrine, which is very easie to be understood, and easily rescued from those Scholastick Absurdities which are charged on it, if that were its only fault. For the true Representation of it, is by considering the Nature of a Proxy, and legal Representative, which acts in another's name and stead.

Having thus considered what is the Notion of Image-Worship, according to *Thomas*, and *Durandus*, and Monsieur *de Meaux*, that it is a worshipping the Image in the name and stead of the Prototype, as its Proxy and Representative, worshipping the Image as representing Christ, as *Thomas* speaks, or worshipping Christ before his Image as represented by it, as *Durandus* and *M. de Meaux* speak. We have now some Foundation to build on; and I think they have no reason to complain that I have stated it in this manner, which grants them all they can desire or ask for, *viz.* That they do not worship Images, as an Image signifies a Figure of Wood or Stone; but they worship the Image as representing Christ; or if they like that better, Christ as represented in his Image; *That when they honour the Image of an Apostle or Martyr, they do not so much intend to honour the Image, as the Apostle or Martyr in the presence of the Image.* Let us then consider whether this will justify them; and if this will not, I doubt their Cause is desperate. And in order to this, I shall do these three things.

L

I. Shew

1. Shew you, that this is the only intelligible Notion of worshipping God, or Christ, or the Saints, by Images; that Images are a kind of legal Proxies and Representatives, to receive our Worship in the name and stead of Christ, or the Saints.

2. That this is the Scripture Notion of Image-Worship; and that in this sense it is the Scripture condemns the worship of Images, as practised by the Heathens.

3. I shall shew, wherein the Evil of worshipping Images according to this Notion consists.

1. That this is the only intelligible Notion of worshipping God, or Christ, or the Saints, by Images; that Images are a kind of legal Proxies and Representatives to receive our Worship in the name and stead of the Prototype, or the Being represented by them.

The Reason of worshipping Images, is to do Honour to some Divine Being represented by these Images: for the true occasion of Image-Worship, is that fondness Men have for a visible Object of Worship; and because they cannot see the Gods they worship, therefore they set up Images, as visible and representative Deities, to receive their Worship in the name and stead of their Gods. Now if we grant, that Men intend to worship their Gods, in that Worship they pay to, or before their Images, we must grant that these Images are instead of visible Gods to them; or supply the place of their Gods, and receive Worship in their Names.

For to worship God, or any Divine Being, by an Image, can signifie neither more nor less, than to Worship God, or Christ, or the Saints, in that Worship which we give to their Images: for God cannot be worshipped in an Image any otherwise, than as the Worship which is given to the Image is his Worship, and given in his Name: for *B* can be worshipped in *A*, only as *A* is *B*'s Representative, and is worshipped in his name and stead. To worship any Being, is to worship his Person; and therefore we must either worship him in his own natural Person, or in his Representative, who is his legal Person.

As to shew you this particularly.

If any Men were ever so sottish as to believe their Images themselves, that is, the visible Figures of Wood, or Stone, or Brals, to be Gods, and to worship them as Gods, such Men cannot be said to worship God by an Image, but to worship an Image-God; for the Image itself is their God, and the Worship terminates on the Image as God. They may be said to worship false Gods, Gods, in a strict and proper sense, of Wood and Stone; but to worship God by an Image, and to worship the Image itself for a God, are very distinct things: and if the Scripture forbids the Worship of God by an Image, it will not justify Image-Worship, to say, that some Heathens were such Sots, as to believe their Images themselves to be Gods; for Men who are not such Sots, may Worship their Gods by Images, as all those Heathens did, who acknowledged their Images to be only Symbols and Representations of their Gods, and therefore not to be Gods themselves; for the same thing cannot be a Symbol and Representation of itself; which is as good sense as to say, that a Sign, and the thing signified by it, is the same.

To give a proper, though inferior degree of worship to Images themselves, is not to worship God or Christ by his Image, because in this case, the Worship they give to the Image of Christ, is not such a Worship as is proper for Christ, and is terminated not on Christ, but on his Image. No Worship is proper to be given to Christ, but the Worship of *Latria*, or Supream and Sovereign Worship: but the *Roman* Doctors, who embrace this Opinion, deny with the Second Council of *Nice*, that *Latria* may be given to Images, and in general reject the Doctrine of *Thomas*, that the Image is to be worshipped with the Worship due to the Prototype: And how then can Christ be worshipped in his Image, if no Worship is given to the Image, which is fit for Christ to receive? when the Image has no Worship given it, but such as is proper to itself, considered as Christ's Image, will they call this the Worship of Christ? especially since this Worship which is given to the Image, is terminated on the Image as its own proper and peculiar Worship, as *Ca-*

Barinus and *Bellarmino*, and all of this way acknowledge ; who reject *Thomas's* Doctrine of worshipping the Image, with the worship of the Prototype represented by it, because this is not properly the Worship of the Image, but of the Prototype ; and therefore that the Image may be sure to be worshipped, they give it an inferiour degree of Worship, which terminates on itself. Now how Christ should be worshipped in that Worship which terminates on his Image ; that is, how that Worship which ends in the Image, and goes no farther, should pass through the Image, and end in Christ, as it must do, if Christ be worshipped in the Image, is past my understanding, as all Contradictions are.

But they refer the Worship of the Image to the Prototype. But it is worth enquiring how they do it ; Do they intend the Worship they give to the Image for Christ ? that is, Do they intend to worship Christ in that Worship they give to his Image ? No : they can't do that, because they give only an inferiour degree of Worship to the Image, which is not worthy of Christ ; not a Worship proper for him, but only for his Image : but they worship the Image for the sake of Christ ; and this they take to be an Honour to Christ to worship his Image : but this is not to worship Christ in or by his Image ; for in this way Christ is not worshipped in that Worship we give to his Image, but it is to worship the Image for Christ's sake, which is, by interpretation an Honour to Christ ; as any respect we shew to the Image of the King, argues our Esteem and Honour for our King, whose Image it is : but these two differ as much as to honour Christ in our Actions, and to worship him, as to do something which is, by interpretation, an Honour to Christ, and to make our immediate Addressees, to offer up our Prayers and Thanksgivings to him. Every thing we do for the Honour of Christ, is not presently an Act of Worship ; and therefore though we should grant, that we honour Christ in the Worship of his Image, it does not follow, that therefore we worship him in worshipping his Image, when we give no Worship at all to him, but only to his Image ; which plainly shews, that in this way they do not worship Christ
by

by his Image, but only worship the Image for Christ's sake. Which is a plain Argument to me, that though this Way has very great and learned Advocates, yet it cannot be the meaning of the Council of *Trent*, because it is not reconcilable with the Practice of the Church of *Rome*; which prays every day to Christ, and the blessed Virgin, to Saints and Martyrs, before their Images, in such terms as are proper only to be used to themselves; which besides the other Faults of it, is horrid Non-sense, if they do not intend to worship Christ and the Saints in their Images.

Much less do those worship the Prototypes in their Images, who only use Images as helps to Memory, and to excite devout Affections in them, that at the sight of the Image they may offer up more fervent Prayers to God or Christ: for though this practice may and has a great many other Faults in it, yet this is neither in the intention of the Worshipper, to worship the Image, nor the Exemplar by the Image. Monsieur *de Meaux*, by some Expressions he uses, would persuade his Readers, that this is all the Church of *Rome* intends in the use of Images; and yet he owns the Doctrine of the Council of *Trent*, *That the Honour of the Image is referred to the Prototype, because by the Images which we kiss, and before which we uncover our Heads, and prostrate our selves, we adore Christ, and worship the Saints, whose Likeness they bear.* Which plainly signifies, that we worship Christ and the Saints in the worship of their Images; and therefore though Images may be helps to Memory also, yet they must be honoured and worshipped, that Christ and his Saints may be worshipped in them, and by them; which is a very different thing from being bare Signs to help our Memories, and quicken our Devotions. There is no need of Consecration for this End; and the Church takes no notice of this use of them in her Forms of Consecration. These are all the Pretences I have met with for the use of Images in Religious Worship; and it is evident from what I have said, that there is no other sense, wherein God or Christ can be said to be worshipped by an Image, but only as the Image receives the Worship due to Christ in his name and stead, as if it were his legal Proxy and Representative; which, as I have

have shewed, is the true Interpretation, both of the Doctrine of *Durandus*, and *Monsieur de Meaux*, and *Thomas* in this Matter.

2dly, I am now to shew, that it is in this Notion the Scripture forbids the Worship of Images, as the Representatives of God, or any Divine Being, to receive our Worship in God's Name and Stead. It is true indeed, the Second Commandment, which forbids the worship of Images, takes no notice of the Distinctions of the Schools, in what Notion an Image is worshipped, or what kind and degree of Worship is given to it; but the words are so large and general, as to exclude all use of Images in Religious Worship. The Worship which is expressly forbidden in the Commandment to be given to Images, is only the External Acts of Worship, such as to bow down to them; which is the very least that can be done, if Men make any use of Images in Religious Worship: The Images which are forbidden to be worshipped, are all sorts of Images whatever; *The likeness of any Thing which is in Heaven above, or in the Earth beneath, or in the Water under the Earth.* And how extravagant soever Mens Fancies are, they cannot well form any Image, but must be like to some of these things, either in whole or in part. But the Commandment takes no notice of Mens different Opinions about Images, whether they look upon them as Gods, or Representatives of God, or helps to Memory and Devotion: for since the design of the Commandment is to forbid the use of Images in Religious Worship, it was dangerous to leave any room for Distinctions; which is to make every Man judge, what is an innocent, and what is a sinful use of Images; which would utterly evacuate the Law; for Men of Wit can find out some Apology or other for the grossest Superstitions.

As for instance:

I find a notable Criticism in the Advertisement to *Monsieur de Meaux's* Exposition, (p. 14) That *the Images forbidden in the Second Commandment, are those which are forbidden to be made, as well as to be worshipped.* The Consequence of which is, That the Worship of such Images as may be lawfully made, is not forbidden in this Law; and then indeed

deed there is room enough for the Worship of Images: unless he will say, That it is unlawful to make the Images of any thing in Heaven or Earth, or under the Earth; but then they can have no Images to worship. *Tertullian* indeed, and some others, condemned the very Arts of Painting and Carving Images, as forbid in the Second Commandment: and it is certainly unlawful to make any Image in order to worship it. But I desire to know of this Author, whether it be lawful to make an Image or Picture of the Sun, and Moon, and Planets; of Birds and Beasts, of Men and Women, which are the Likeness of Things in Heaven, and Things on Earth? If it be, then the making of those Images is not forbid in the Second Commandment, and then the worship of them is not forbid neither. But he says, *He means such Images as are made to represent God, and those which are made to shew him present, and which are worshipped with the same intention as full of his Divinity.* But is this the Work of the Carver, or the Painter, to make a God? Can the Pencil, or the Knife, put Divinity into a Picture or Image? This is the work of him that Consecrates, and him that Worships.

*Qui fingit Sacros auro vel marmore vultus
Non facit ille Deos, qui colit, ille facit.*

He had forgot the Brazen Serpent which *Hezekiah* broke, the making of which, I suppose, was not forbid in the second Command, but it seems the worship of it was. But to return:

Though the Second Commandment forbids the worship of all sorts of Images, and every act and degree of Worship, without leaving room for any Exceptions or Distinctions; yet we may learn from Scripture, what was the current Notion of Image-Worship at that time, viz. That they worshipped their Images, not for Gods, but for Symbols and Representations of their Gods; that is, they set them up as visible Objects of Worship, to receive their Worship in the name and stead of their Gods: They did not worship the Images themselves, but their Gods in and by their Images.

Indeed,

Indeed, this is the only Notion of Image-Worship that any Men ever had; till Christians began to worship Images, and then were forced to defend it, and to distinguish away the Idolatry of it.

This is the Account the Heathens gave of their Worship of Images; That they did not believe them to be Gods, but only worshipped their Gods in their Images. Thus Cicero alcribes the making Images of their Gods in humane shape, to their Superstition, *Ut essent simulacra, quæ venerantes Deos ipsos se adire crederent*, that they might have Images to make their Addresses to, as if the Gods themselves were present.

Max. Tyrius, And *Maximus Tyrius* gives a large Account of their Images to the same purpose, That they are all but so many Pictures and Representations of the Deity, to bring us to the conception of him; and it matters not what the Image be, so it bring God to our Thoughts, and direct our Worship to him; *ὅτι οὐκ ἐν τοῖς εἰκόσι θεοὶ μένον.* *Celsus* and *Julian* deny that they thought their Images to be Gods; and so did the Heathens in *Arnobius*, *Athanasius*, and *St. Austin*, as those Fathers acknowledge. And *Julian* tells us, That a lover of God loves the Representations of the Gods; and beholding their Images, doth secretly fear and reverence them, which although invisible themselves, do behold him. And *Dio Chrysostom*, in his Olympick Oration, gives this Account why Men are so fond of Images, which they know cannot express the invisible and inexpressible Nature of God; *Because Mankind doth not love to worship God at a distance, but to come near and feel him, and with assurance Sacrifice to him, and Crown him.* Nay, those very Heathens who believed that some invisible Spirits after Consecration were, not incorporated with their Images, (which it does not appear to me, that any of them thought) but present in them; did not therefore worship the material Figure, but through the visible Image, worshipped those invisible Spirits which were hid in it. *Non hoc visibile colo, sed numen quod illic invisibiliter habitat.* And therefore *Arnobius* says, That they formed the Images of their Gods, *Vicariis substitutione*, that is, to set them in the place of God, to be a vicarious Object of Worship, to receive their Worship in the name of their Gods;

De Natura deorum, l. 1. c. 27.

Max. Tyrius, dissert. 38.

See Dr. Stillingfleet's Defence of the Discourse of Idolatry, p. 466. &c.

Dio Chrys. Orat. 12.

St. Aug. in Psal. 113.

Arnob. l. 6.

Gods; and that God receives their Worship by Images, *per quædam fidei commissa*, by way of Trust; as if they were intrusted to receive their Worship for God in his stead. Hence St. *Austin* tells us, that no Image of God ought to be worshipped, but only Christ, who is what he is; and he not to be worshipped *instead of God*, but together with him; which shews plainly what Notion the Father had of proper Image-Worship; that it is to worship the Image instead of God: and therefore tho' Christ be such an Image of God as must be worshipped, yet he must not be worshipped as an Image; that is, not in the stead, but together with God. And St. *Hierom* on *Rom. 1.* gives the same Notion of Image-Worship, *Quomodo invisibilis Deus per simulacrum visibile coloratur*; that it is to worship the invisible God by a visible Image: and therefore falling down before their Images is called by *Arnobius*, *Deorum ante ora prostrati*, prostrating themselves before the Face of their Gods; which is aptly expressed by *Cæsar*, *ante simulacra projecti victoriam a Diis exposcerent*, falling down before their Images, they begged Victory of their Gods. And in those days before they were acquainted with School-Distinctions, to pray to their Gods before their Images, and fixing their Eyes on them, was thought to be Image-worship; thus St. *Austin* expresses it by *adorat vel orat intuens simulacrum*, adoring, or praying, looking upon an Image: and so does *Ovid*, *Summissoq; genu vultus in imagine Divæ fixit*, with bended Knees he fixes his Eye upon the Image of the Goddess: and indeed all the Arguments of the ancient Fathers against the Worship of Images are levelled against this Notion of it, that they worshipped their Gods by Images, not that they thought their Images to be Gods. This then being the received Notion of Image-Worship among the Heathens, in which they all agreed, as far as we have any account of their Opinions, and being the only intelligible account that can be given of the Worship of Images, we have reason to believe, that the Second Commandment, which forbids the Worship of Images, had a principal regard to it; but I have other Arguments from the Scripture itself to confirm this Opinion.

Aug. Ep. 119.
C. 11.

Arn. l. 1.

Cæsar de Bello
Civ. l. 2.

Ovid. Fast. 4.

M

1. The

1. The first is from the first Example of Image-worship among the *Israelites* after the giving this Law ; that is, the Worship of the Golden Calf, which *Aaron* made while *Moses* was in the Mount : That this Calf was intended only as a Symbolical Representation of the God of *Israel*, and that they worshipped the Lord *Jehovah* in the Worship of this Calf, is so evident from the whole Story, that I confess I do not think that Man fit to be disputed with, who denies it ; for he must either want Understanding, or Honesty, to be convinced of the plainest matter, which he has no mind to believe. The occasion of their making this Calf, was the absence of *Moses*, who was a kind of a living Oracle, and Divine Presence with them. They said to *Aaron*,
 Exod. 32. 1. *Up, make us Gods, which shall go before us : for as for this Moses, the Man who brought us up out of the Land of Egypt, we wot not what is become of him.* So that they wanted not a new God, but only a Divine Presence with them, since *Moses*, who used to acquaint them with the Will of God, and govern them by a Divine Spirit, was so long absent, that they thought him lost ; when the Calf was made, they said, *These be thy Gods, O Israel, which brought Thee out of the Land of Egypt.* Which they could not possibly understand of the Calf, which was but then made. For tho' we should think them so silly, as to believe it to be a God, it was impossible they should think that the Calf brought them out of *Egypt*, before itself was made : Nor could they think any *Egyptian* Gods delivered them out of *Egypt* to the ruine and desolation of their own Country ; especially, since they certainly knew, that it was only the Lord *Jehovah*, who brought them out of *Egypt* by the hand of *Moses* ; and therefore *Aaron* built an Altar before it, and proclaimed a Feast to the Lord, or to *Jehovah*, as the word is : which makes it very plain to any unprejudiced Man, that they intended to worship the Lord *Jehovah* in the Worship of the Golden Calf, which they made for a symbolical Representation and Presence of God ; which no doubt was very agreeable to the notion the *Egyptians* had of their Images, from whom they learn'd this way of Worship ; and I need not tell any Man how displeasing this was to God.

See Dr. Scl-
 ling's Defence
 of Disc. of Ido-
 latry, p. 747,
 &c.

2. Ano-

2. Another Argument of this, is, That Images are called Gods in Scripture, *Isa. 44. 10. Who hath fashioned a God, or molten a Graven Image, which is profitable for nothing.——He maketh a God and worshippeth it; he maketh it a Graven Image, and falleth down thereto.——The residue thereof he maketh a God, even his Graven Image, and worshippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and saith, Deliver me, for thou art my God.* I need not multiply places for the proof of this; for this is own'd by all the Advocates of the Church of *Rome*, and relied on as the great support of their Cause. From hence they say, it is plain in what sense God forbids the Worship of Images, *viz.* when Men worship their Images for Gods, as the Text asserts the Heathens did. But tho' the Church of *Rome* worships Images, yet she does not worship them for Gods, but only worships God, or Christ, or the Saints in and by their Images. This is the reason of their great Zeal to make the First and Second Commandment but one; because the first Commandment forbidding the Worship of all false Gods, If that which we call the Second Commandment, which forbids the Worship of Images, be reckoned only as part of the First, then they think it plain in what sense the Worship of Images is forbid, *viz.* only as the Worship of false Gods; and therefore those cannot be charged with the breach of this Commandment, who do not believe their Images to be Gods.

Now besides what I have already said, to prove that the Heathens did not believe the Images themselves to be Gods, which is so sottish a Conceit, as no man of common Sense can be guilty of; I have several Arguments to prove, that the Scripture does not understand it in this sense.

1. The first is, That the Golden Calf is called *Gods of Gold, Exod. 32. 31.* and yet it is evident, they did not believe the Calf to be a God, but only a Symbol and Representation of the Lord *Jehovah*, whom they worshipped in the Calf.

2. The very name of an Image, which signifies a Likeness and Representation of some other Being, is irreconcilable with such a Belief, that the Image itself is a God; that the Image is that very God, whom it is made to represent;

which signifies, that the likeness of God, is that very God whose likeness it is : especially, when the Scripture, which calls such Images Gods, calls them also the Images of their Gods.

Which is proof enough, that tho' the Scripture calls Images Gods, it does not understand it in that sense, that they believe their material Images to be Gods ; for it is a contradiction to say, that the Image of *Baal*, is both their God *Baal*, and his Image at the same time ; for the Image is not the thing it represents.

3. The Arguments urged in Scripture against Images, plainly prove, that they were not made to be Gods, but only Representations of God. One Argument is, because they saw no similitude of God when he spoke to them in *Horeb* out of the midst of the Fire : another, that they can make no likeness of Him. To *whom then will ye liken God, or what likeness will ye compare to him ? — To whom then will ye liken* Deut. 4. 15. *me, or shall I be equal, saith the Holy One ?* Thus St. Paul argues Ifa. 40. 18, 27. with the Philosophers at *Athens* ; For as much then as we Acts 17. 29. *are the Offspring of God, we ought not to think the Godhead to be like to Gold and Silver, and Stone graven by Art, and Man's Device.* Now what do all these Arguments signify against making a God ; for if they can make a God, what matter is it who their God be like, so he be a God ? It is a good Argument against making any Image and Representation of God, that it is impossible to make any thing like him ; but it is enough for a God to be like itself.

In what sense then, you'll say, does the Scripture call Images Gods ? there is but one possible sense, that I know of, and that is, that they are vicarious and substituted Gods ; that they are set up in God's place, to represent his Person, and to receive our Worship in his name and stead, and so are Gods by Office, tho' not by Nature. They are visible Representations of the invisible God, they bear his Name and receive his Worship ; as the Golden Calf was called *Jehovah*, and the Worship of the Calf was called a Feast unto the Lord : And this is some reason for their being called Gods ; as the Proxy and Substitute acts in the name of the Person he represents : Which proves that this is the Scripture

ture Notion of Image-Worship, that the Image is worshipped in Gods name and stead. And to this purpose I observe, That tho' εἶδωλον, or an Idol, signifies a false God; yet it signifies such a false God as is only the Image and Figure of another God; for so εἶδωλον, signifies εἶκον and ὁμοίωμα, a likeness or similitude. Thus *Tertullian* tells us, *Eorum imagines Idola, imaginum consecratio Idolatria*: That their Images are Idols, and the Consecration of them is Idolatry. Thus the Author of the Book of Wisdom attributes the original of Idolatry, to *Fathers making Images for their Children who were dead, and appointing Solemnities to be kept before them as if they were Gods; and thus by degrees Princes passed these things into Laws, and made men to worship graven Images; and thus either out of affection or flattery the Worship of Idols began.* Which shews what he means by Idols, Images consecrated for the Worship of God. And therefore he distinguishes the Worship of Idols, from the Worship of the Elements and heavenly Bodies, when this was done without an Image: And therefore no God is in Scripture called an Idol, but with respect to its Image. Thus Idols and Molten Gods are join'd together; as expounding each other. And the Psalmist tells us, *The Idols of the Heathens are Silver and Gold, the work of mens hands.* So that an Idol is a false God, as it signifies a material Image made to represent some God, as a visible Object of Worship, to receive the Worship of that God whose Name it bears, in his place and stead.

To the same purpose the Scripture charges these Image-Worshippers with changing the Glory of God into the Likeness and Similitude of those Creatures whereby they represented him. The *Israelites* made the Image of a Golden Calf, as the symbolical Representation and Presence of the Lord *Jehovah*; and the Psalmist tells us, that by so doing, *they changed their Glory (i. e. the Lord Jehovah, who was the Glory of Israel) into the similitude of an Ox which eateth grass.* Which necessarily supposes, that they intended to represent the Lord *Jehovah* in the Image of the Calf; not that they thought their God to be like the Calf, but as they made a vicarious and visible God of it, and worshipped it in the Name of the Lord *Jehovah*. Thus St. Paul describes the Idolatry of the Heathens, *That they changed the glory of the incorruptible God, into an image made like to corruptible*

Tertul. de Idol. C. 4.

Wisdom C. 14. V. 15.

C. 13. V. 6.

Levit. 19. 4. Psal. 135. 15.

Rom. 1. 23.

ruptible man, and four-footed Beasts, and creeping Things. But of this more presently; this is sufficient to shew, what the Scripture Notion of Image-Worship is, and in what Sense it condemns it.

3dly, Let us now consider wherein the evil of this Image-Worship consists, which will greatly contribute to the right understanding of this whole dispute. Now the account of it in general is very short and plain, That the evil of Image-Worship when we worship the true God by an Image, does not so much consist in the Kinds, or Degrees, or Object of Worship, as in Representation; and if this prove the true account of it, as I believe it will appear to be to all considering men before I have done, it will quite alter the state of this Controversie, and put *M. de Meaux*, and the Representer, to find out some new Expositions and Representations of their Image-Worship.

1. That the evil of Image-Worship when men worship the true God by an Image, does not principally consist in the Kinds, or Degrees, or Object of Worship. Such men indeed are said in Scripture to worship Images, and Idols, and Molten Gods, and that their Idols are Silver and Gold, Wood and Stone; for when they worship God by an Image, they must worship the Image; or else they cannot worship God in it, tho' they worship the Image not for itself, but for the Prototype, as the Council of *Trent* determines, which is more properly worshipping God or Christ in or before his Image, as *M. de Meaux* expounds it, than worshipping the Image, and they are said to worship Images rather with respect to the Manner than to the Object of Worship, as you shall here more presently. The Church of *Rome* indeed, as her Doctrine and Practice is expounded by her most famed Divines, may justly be charged with worshipping Images in the grossest sense; as that signifies giving Religious Worship to the material Image of Wood and Stone; which is strictly to worship Stocks and Stones as Gods. This Charge may be easily made good against all those who teach that the Image is to be properly worshipped, and that either a relative *Latria*, or some proper inferiour Worship is to be terminated on the Image as its material Object, and yet most of the *Roman* Doctors attribute one or t'other to the Image, as distinct from that worship they give to the Prototype; and dispute very learnedly, that this is the

the Doctrine both of the Second Council of *Nice*, and of the Council of *Trent*, That a proper Worship must be given to the Image, distinct from that Worship which is given to the Prototype; but they cannot yet agree, whether it be a relative improper analogical *Latria*, which must be given to the Image of Christ, or only *Dulia*, or an inferiour degree of Religious Worship.

This has hitherto been the chief Seat of the Controversie between *Protestants* and *Papists* about Image-Worship; and *M. de Meaux* seems very sensible, That attributing a proper Worship to Images, so as to terminate it on them, gives too just occasion for the charge of Idolatry, and puts them to hard shifts to vindicate themselves from it; and therefore he owns no Worship due to the Image for itself, but only as it represents the Prototype, which therefore is not so properly the Worship of the Image, as of the Prototype by the Image; and here I perfectly agree with him, That the true Notion of Image-Worship is not to worship the Image at all, considered in itself, as a material Figure of Wood and Stone, but only to worship God or Christ in the Image. And therefore I shall set aside this Dispute, in what sense, or how far a *Papist* may be charged with worshipping the material Image, which has occasioned eternal wranglings, and yet does not properly belong to the Controversie of Image-Worship. To worship a material Image, is to give the worship of God to Creatures; to Wood and Stone; but Image-Worship is in its strict Notion, not giving Divine Worship to Images, but worshipping God in and by the Image which represents him, which in Scripture is called worshipping Images: And therefore tho' we should grant, that *M. de Meaux's* Exposition avoids the first charge of giving Religious Worship to Wood and Stone, because he denies that they properly worship the Image, but only the Prototype in the Image; yet the whole guilt of Image-Worship, as that signifies the worship of God by Images, not the worship of the material Image, is chargeable upon him still, that is, the worship of the Prototype by the Image, which is all that is forbid in the Second Commandment.

This, it may be, will be thought a giving up the Cause, to grant, that the Church of *Rome* may worship God or Christ
by

by Images, and yet not be chargeable with worshipping the Images themselves, or the material Figures of Wood or Stone ; and therefore it will be necessary to shew, that the true Notion of Idolatry or Image-Worship is not giving Religious Worship to the Images themselves, but worshipping God by Images, and what the difference between these two is. -

1. And the first thing I shall observe to this purpose, is the difference between the First and Second Commandment, which all Protestants own and defend against the Church of *Rome*, which makes the Second Commandment only a Branch and Appendix of the First. Now the First Commandment forbids all false Objects of Worship, the worship of all Creatures and fictitious Deities, and therefore the worship of all Beings besides God, whether rational, animate, or inanimate, is a breach of the First Commandment, and must be reduced to it ; and consequently the Second Commandment which forbids the Worship of Images, cannot forbid them as false Objects, (for all such are forbid in the First Commandment) but as a false and corrupt way of Worship ; and therefore Image-Worship as it is forbid in the Second Commandment, cannot signify worshipping the Image itself, as distinguished from the Prototype, for that would make it a false Object of Worship against the First Commandment ; but only a false and superstitious way of representing and worshipping God by an Image.

2/y, And therefore I observe, that an Image does not alter the Object of Worship, which yet it must necessarily do, if it were essential to the Notion of Image-Worship to worship the Image itself, which would make the Image a new Object of Worship. Now it is plain, that men who do not dispute themselves into endless Subtilties and Distinctions, intend no more in the worship of Images, than to worship that God whose Image it is, and therefore the Object of Worship is the same with or without an Image. They who worship the True God with an Image, and they who worship him without an Image, worship the same God though in a different manner ; and besides what judgment men make of their own Actions, and what they intend to do, the Scripture itself acknowledges this. When the *Israelites* made a Golden Calf, *Aaron* proclaims a Feast to the Lord *Jehovah*, which proves that they intended to worship the same God still in the Golden

golden Calf, which they did before without it. Thus the two Calves which *Jeroboam* set up, were made in imitation of the golden Calf, and for Symbolical Representations of the God of *Israel*, who was worshipped by them, for it is plain that *Jeroboam* did not intend to change their God, but only to prevent their going up to *Jerusalem* to worship God there; and therefore he tells them, *It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem, behold thy Gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the Land of Egypt*; that is, the Lord *Jehovah*. Now we may observe, that God himself, though he was grievously offended with the sin of *Jeroboam*, yet he makes a great difference between the sin of *Jeroboam* and the sin of *Abah*, who introduced the worship of *Baal* a false God, whereas *Jeroboam* retained the worship of the true God, though he worshipped him in a false and idolatrous manner. If the Calves of *Dan* and *Bethel* had been false Gods, as *Baal* was, the sin had been equally provoking; but the worship of the Calves did not change their God, as the worship of *Baal* did; and therefore *Elijah* distinguishes the *Israelites* into the Worshippers of God and of *Baal*: *How long halt ye between two Opinions? if the Lord be God, follow him; but if Baal, then follow him*; and yet most of those who are said to be Worshippers of God, did worship God at the Calves of *Dan* and *Bethel*, which was the established Religion of the Kingdom. And thus *Jehu*, tho' he departed not from the sin of *Jeroboam*, the golden Calves in *Dan* and *Bethel*, yet he calls his Zeal in destroying *Baal* out of *Israel*, his Zeal for the Lord *Jehovah*.

Now if the worship of an Image do not change the Object of our Worship, neither in the intention of the Worshipper, nor in the account of Scripture, as I have now proved, it evidently follows, that the Image is not worshipped as an Object, but as a Medium of Worship; it receives no Worship for itself, but only for God whom it represents. And that which is so offensive to God in it, is not that they set up any Rival and Opposite Gods against him, but that they worship him in a reproachful and dishonourable manner, which makes him abhor and reject the Worship, and because he will not receive this Worship himself, he calls it worshipping Idols and graven Images, and molten Gods, that is, vicarious and representative Gods, which though they receive the worship in God's Name, yet are an infinite reproach

to his Majesty by that vile and contemptible Representation they make him. This is the strict Notion of Idolatry, not the giving the worship of God to Creatures; which is the breach of the First Commandment in making new Gods, but the worship of God by an Image, which makes such Images Gods by Representation, but not the Objects, but only the *Medium* of Worship; and therefore though we should grant *M. de Meaux* that he does not worship Images, but only Christ and the Saints in or before their Images, this does not excuse him from Idolatry, which does not signify worshipping an Image in a strict sense; but only worshipping God in an Image, which terminates all the worship not on the Image but on God.

3ly, Let us now consider wherein the Evil of this Idolatry or Image-Worship does consist; and that I said was in Representation; which I shall briefly explain in these particulars. 1. That it is an infinite reproach to the Divine Nature and Perfections, to be represented by an Image: *To whom will ye liken God? Or what likeness will ye compare to him? The workman melteth a graven-Image, and the Goldsmith spreadeth it over with Gold, and casteth Silver Chains. He that is so impoverished that he hath no Oblation, chuseth a Tree that will not rot: he seeketh unto him a cunning Workman to prepare a graven Image that shall not be moved. Have ye not known? Have ye not heard? Hath it not been told you from the beginning? Have ye not understood from the foundations of the earth? It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the Inhabitants thereof are as Grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the Heavens as a Curtain, and spreadeth them out as a Tent to dwell in.* How incongruous and absurd is it, to make a Picture or Image of that God who is invisible? to represent a pure Mind by Matter, dull senseless Matter! to give the shape and figure of a Man, or some viler Creature, to that God who has none! to make an Image for the Maker of the World, and to bring that Infinite Being to the scantlings and dimensions of a Man, who fills Heaven and Earth with his Presence! If it be the Glory of God to be what he is, a pure, infinite, eternal, invisible Mind! it is a contradiction and dishonour to him to be represented by a material visible Image like to some of his own Creatures, but inferiour to the meanest living Creatures, because without Life and Sense. Thus *St. Paul* argues, *Acts* 17. 29.

Ira. 40. 12,
19, &c.

For-

Forasmuch then as we are the Off-spring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto Gold or Silver, or Stone graven by Art, and mans Device. If we think God to be like to such Images, we know nothing of him ; and if we make such Images as we know are not like to God, nay a reproach to his Nature and Perfections, we wilfully affront him. And though Christ conversed in this World in human Nature, which is representable by an Image, yet an Image is not a proper Representation of Christ, as the Object of Worship, because it cannot represent the Divine Nature, which is the Reason and Foundation of Worship. And as for Saints, they ought not to be worshipped at all, and therefore not worshipped by Images : And indeed, that very Law which forbids the Worship of Images without any exception, and yet upon such Reasons as are peculiar to the infinite Nature of God, are a plain Argument to me, that no Being which is representable by human Art, is an Object of Worship.

2. To set up an Image in the place of God, has a great appearance and suspicion of worshipping a material and visible God, of giving Divine Honours to Gold and Silver, and the work of mens hands ; for tho' men pretend to worship God in the Image, Yet how does the Image come to be worshipped for God? What likeness? What relation is there between them? How easily may men slip into the worship of Images themselves, and forsake God, or never mind him, for the sake of a fine Picture, or some beautiful or wonder-working Image? for tho' there is a great deal of difference between worshipping God by an Image, and worshipping the Image itself, yet to all appearance they are so like one another, and there is so easie a passage from one to the other, that God's displeasure against this Sin is expressed in Scripture by Jealousie ; a Passion which expresses both Suspicion and Caution ; while they profess to Worship God by their Images, they do not change their God, but yet their worshipping a visible Image, looks very like it, and is an easie introduction to it. Thus in the Second Commandment, the Reason with which God enforces his Prohibition against worshipping Images is, *For I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, Thus Psal. 78. 58. For they provoked him to anger with their high places, and moved him to jealousy with their graven Images.* And therefore he ex-

presses himself with some Passion and Concernment in this matter. *I am the Lord, that is my Name, and my Glory will I not give to another, neither my Praise to Graven Images, Isa. 42. 8.* The Church is called God's Spouse, and the worship of false Gods is called Whoredom and Adultery, going after other Gods; and the worship of the true God by Images, tho' it be not Whoredom, yet it is such a kind of Spiritual Wantonness and Incontinency, as excites his Jealousie.

3. Especially when we consider, that the Worship of Images does naturally expose us to the Cheats and Impostures of wicked Spirits; for this reason I observed before, God forbids the Worship of any other invisible Being but himself; for if men were allowed to Worship inferiour Spirits, bad Spirits who inhabit these lower Regions, would soon have the greatest share in their Worship; and thus it is with Images, which are such an offence and dishonour to God, that we cannot expect that he will ever shew himself present in them, or guard them from the possession of evil Spirits. It is evident that in the Heathen World, evil Spirits possessed their Images, and abused mankind with their lying Wonders, and lying Oracles, and I have some reason to believe, that if any Miracles are wrought still at Images, they are not by good Spirits, because Images are an Abomination to God; and therefore, *Rom. 1.* St. Paul attributes the general corruption of mens lives and manners to the Worship of Images; *They changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds and fourfooted beasts, and creeping things; wherefore God gave them up to uncleanness—for this cause God gave them up to vile affections—and even as they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind to do these things which are not convenient.* The meaning of which is, That God gave them over to the delusions of wicked Spirits, who lurked in their Images, and first corrupted their Religion, and then their Lives by impure and barbarous Rites of Worship.

4. If there were no other hurt in Image-Worship, yet it debases human Nature to fall down before a senseless Image: As it is a dishonour to God to be worshipped by an Image, tho' the Worship be intended for himself, and not for the Image, because it makes so mean and vile Representation of him; so it is a reproach

proach to a man, who is a reasonable Creature, and made after the Image of God, to fall down before Stocks and Stones, with all external Submissions and Adorations, tho' he intends not to worship the material Image, but God by it; because the visible Object before which we pay our Worship is so much below the honour and dignity of human Nature, it is a reproach to the Understanding of a Man to think that a material Image is a decent Representation of God, and a fit Medium of Worship; and he must have a mean and beggarly Spirit, who can be contented to bow down before it. Thus *Arnobius* aggravates the madness of this, *Supplicare tremebundum factuatæ abs te rei*: To fall down trembling, and to supplicate that which thou thy self hast made. And a greater than *Arnobius* tells us, *They that make them, are like unto them, so is every one who putteth their trust in them.* Arnob. l. 6. Psal. 135. 13.

sly, The Worship of God by Images is contrary not only to the Law of *Moses*, but to the reason of Mankind; it gratifies indeed a fleshly and sensual Mind to have a visible Object of Worship, but God is the only natural Object of Worship; and reason tells us, that God is invisible; and Reason will tell us, that it is contrary to the Nature of an invisible Being, to be worshipped under a visible Representation; it is not only a Reproach to the Divine Nature, but an absurd and unreasonable Worship. For what considering man can think it reasonable to worship a visible Image instead of an invisible God? Reason can never justify a Worship so contradictory to the Divine Nature, and therefore Reason can never teach men to worship an Image. For what is it they intend by worshipping Images? Have they a mind to see the God they Worship? But how unreasonable is this, when they know he is invisible, and would not be a God if he could be seen? And how absurd is it to represent him by an Image, when they know they can make no Image like him? No worship can be natural, which contradicts the nature of that Being whom we Worship; and if it be not natural, it must be instituted Worship; and then, tho' it were forbid by no Law, it must be commanded by some Law, to make it reasonable, at least if it be possible that a Law could make that an Act of Honour and Worship, which is a dishonour to the Divine Perfections.

6ly, It is more especially contrary to the nature of the Christian Worship, which teaches us to form a more spiritual Idea of God, and to worship him in Spirit and in Truth; in opposition not only to all sensible Representations, but to all symbolical Presences. There are two things principally, for which Images are intended, to be visible Representations, and a visible Presence of the Deity. The first of these is so great a reproach to the Divine Nature, that it was forbid by the Law of *Moses*, which was at best a less perfect Dispensation, as being accommodated to the carnal State of that People; but as to the Second, God himself gratified them in it, for he dwelt among them in the Tabernacle, and afterwards in the Temple of *Jerusalem*, where he placed the Symbols of his Presence. But now when the Woman of *Samarita* asked our Saviour about the place of Worship, whether it was the Temple at *Jerusalem*, or *Samarita*. He answers, *The hour cometh when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem worship the Father. But the true Worshipers shall worship the Father in Spirit and in Truth, for the Father seeketh such to worship him. God is a Spirit, and they that worship him, must worship him in Spirit and in Truth.* Where Christ opposes worshipping in Spirit and in Truth, to worshipping in the Temple, not as a Temple signifies a place separated for Religious Worship, which is a necessary Circumstance of Worship in all Religions; but as it signifies a Symbolical Presence, a Figure of Gods Residence and Dwelling among them, in which sense the Primitive Christians denied that they had any Temples. For God dwelling in human Nature, is the only Divine Presence under the Gospel, of which the Temple was but a Type and Figure. Now if the Spiritual Worship of the Gospel does so withdraw us from sense, as not to admit of a Symbolical Presence, much less certainly does it admit of Images, to represent God present to us, which is so gross and carnal, that God forbid it under the Legal Dispensation. We must consider God as an infinite Mind, present in all places to hear our Prayers, and receive our Worship, and must raise our hearts to Heaven, whether Christ who is the only visible Presence of God is ascended, and not seek for him in carved Wood or Stone, or a curious Piece of Painting.

74, But

Joh. 4. 21, 23.
24.

7thly, But since *M. de Meaux*, and the Representer think it sufficient to justify the worship of Images, that they are of great use to represent the Object of our Worship to us, and to affect us with suitable passions; it will be needful briefly to consider this matter. For I confess I cannot see how a material and visible Image should form a true Idea in us of an invisible Spirit; it is apt to corrupt mens Notions of God and Religion, and to abate our just reverence, by representing the Object of our Worship under so contemptible an appearance. An Image cannot tell us what God is; if we are otherwise instructed in the nature of God, we know that an Image is not like him, but a reproach to the Divine Perfections; if we are not better instructed, we shall think our God like his Image, which will make us very understanding Christians.

But the *Representer* has drawn this Argument out at large, and therefore we must consider what he says of it. That Pictures and Images serve to, 1. *Preserve in his mind the memory of the things represented by them, as People are wont to preserve the memory of their deceased Friends by keeping their Pictures.* But I beseech you, the memory of what does a Picture preserve? Of nothing that I know of, but the external lineaments and features of the Face or Body; and therefore the Images and Pictures of God and the Holy Trinity (which yet are allowed in the Church of *Rome*) cannot serve this end, unless they will say, that God has an external shape as Man has. And suppose we had the exact Pictures of Christ and the Virgin *Mary*, the Apostles and other Saints and Martyrs, this might gratifie our curiosity, but of what use is it in the Christian Religion? To remember Christ, is not to remember his Face, which we never saw, but to remember his Doctrine and his Life; to call to mind his great Love in dying for us; to remember him not as a Man, but as a God incarnate, as our Mediator and Advocate, as our Lord and Judge; and therefore the Gospels which contain the History of his Life, are a much better Picture of Christ, than any drawn by the most curious Pencil; and I doubt, the Christian Religion will not gain much by taking the Gospels out of Peoples hands, and giving them a Picture to gaze on.

Yes,

Yes, says our Author, 2. *He is taught to use them by casting his eye upon the Pictures or Images, and thence to raise his heart to the Prototypes, and there to employ it in Meditation, Love, Thanksgiving, Imitation, &c. as the Object requires.* But he is a very sorry Christian, who never thinks of Christ, but when he sees his Picture. And how can the sight of a Picture raise our hearts to the Love of Christ? The sight indeed of a lovely Picture may excite a sensible Passion, but not a Divine Love; the sight of his Picture can only put us in mind, that there was such a person as Christ in the World; but if we would affect our hearts with his love and praise, we must not gaze on his Face, which is all that a Picture can shew us, if it could do that; but meditate on what he has done and suffered for us, which may be done better without a Picture, than with it. If they want something to put them in mind, that there is such a person as Christ, which is all that his Picture can do, the Name of Christ written upon the Church-Walls would be more innocent, and altogether as effectual to this end.

But Pictures are very instructive, as that of a *Deaths-head*, and *Old Time painted with his Fore-lock, Hour-glass, and Scytbe*; and do inform the mind at one glance, of what in reading requires a Chapter, and sometimes a Volume. Which is so far from being true, that a Picture informs a Man of nothing, but what he was informed of before. The Picture of a Crucifix may put a man in mind of what he has heard or read of Christ's dying upon the Cross; but if he know nothing of the History of Christ's Sufferings, the bare seeing a Crucifix can teach him nothing. Children may be taught by Pictures, which make a more strong impression on their Fancies than Words; but a Picture cannot teach, and at best this is but a very childish way of learning.

3. But devout Pictures are of great use in Prayer, the sight of which cures distractions, and *recalls his wandering thoughts to the right Object, and as certainly brings some good things into his mind, as an immodest Picture disturbs his heart with naughtiness.* But can men read their Prayers, as well as learn the Articles of their Creed, in a Picture too? For even good thoughts are a distraction in Prayers, when they call us off from attending to what we ask of God; and it is to be feared then, that Pictures them-

themselves may distract us, unless we are sure they will suggest no thoughts to us at such a time, but what are in our Prayers; the Church of *Rome* indeed teaching her Children such Prayers as they do not understand, and therefore cannot employ their thoughts, may make Pictures very necessary to entertain them; but if our thoughts and our words ought to go together, as it must be if the Devotion of Prayers consist in praying devoutly, an Image which cannot speak, and a Prayer which is not understood, are like to make men equally devout; should men when they look upon a Crucifix, run over in their minds all the History of our Saviour's Sufferings! should the sight of our Saviour hanging on the Cross affect us with some soft and tender Passions at the remembrance of him! (which it is certain the daily and familiar use of such Pictures cannot do) yet what is this to Prayer? Such sensible Passions as the sight of a Picture can raise in us, are of little or no account in Religion; true devout Affections must spring from an inward Vital Sense, which the Picture cannot give to those who want it, and is of no use to those who have it.

Thus I have, as briefly as the Subject would permit, examined the Doctrine of Praying to Saints, and worshipping Images according to the Exposition of the Bishop of *Condom*, to whom our Author appeals in these points, and this I hope will satisfy him, what we think both of the Bishop's Authority and his Exposition, and ~~how~~ little we like Popery in its best dress. And now it is time to return to our Protester.

And I hope by this time he sees that there is something more needful to clear the Matters in Controversie between us, than barely *M. de Meaux's* Authority; and therefore he resolving not to look beyond the Exposition delivered by this Prelate, I might here very fairly take my leave of him; but I cannot do this, Papist Protest.
p. 27. tho' he be a perfect Stranger to me, without dismissing him civilly with a Complement or two more.

1. Then as to the *Invocation of Saints*, he observes that I deny the Bishop has limited it only to their Prayers, which I own is a mistake; and this is such a Complement as must never be expected from a Doctor of the infallible Church, for he had occasion enough for it, had he had a heart to do it; but I hope I have abundantly made amends for this

now by a fair and particular Examination of the Bishop's Exposition as to that point ; and indeed *M. de Meaux* himself gave the occasion for this, by not owning it in its due place, when he expounded the Decree of the Council, which teaches them to fly to the aid and assistance of the Saints as well as to their Prayers, but shuffling it into the middle of a Sentence at some distance, where no man would expect it. When Expositors dodge at this rate, they may thank themselves if they are mistaken.

Page 28.

2dly, and 3dly, He takes Sanctuary again in the Bishop's Authority to justify his renouncing *the Pope's personal Infallibility, and the Deposing Doctrine*, as no Articles of Faith : But tho' the Bishop indeed do wave *some Things*, as he says, *which are disputed of in the Schools*, as no Articles of Faith, yet he does not say what they are, much less name *the Pope's personal Infallibility, and the Deposing Power* ; and one would think he could not mean *the Deposing Power*, which is determined by General Councils, and therefore must be an Article of Faith. The truth is, the Bishop has here plaid a very cunning Game, and men may make what they please of his words, as their interest or inclination leads them ; if Protestants object the Doctrine of the Pope's Infallibility and Deposing Power, he can easily tell them that these are School-Disputes, and not Articles of Faith ; if the Pope or Roman Doctors quarrel at it, he has then said nothing in disparagement of the Pope's Infallibility and Deposing Power, but has taught that Fundamental Principle on which these Doctrines depend, as in truth he has, when he makes the Primacy of *Peter*, the Cement of Unity, and gives this Primacy to the Bishops of *Rome*, as Successors of the Prince of the Apostles, to whom for this cause we owe that Obedience and Submission which the Holy Councils and Fathers have always taught the Faithful ; though they have not said one word till of late of any such obedience and submission due to them ; especially when we consider what he means by the Primacy of the Pope, that he is a Head established by God to Conduct his whole Flock in his Paths ; which gives him a Supremacy over Bishops and Secular Princes ; and how naturally this infers Infallibility, and a power of deposing Heretical Princes, every one sees, and we have reason to believe the Bishop expounded his Doctrine to this Orthodox

Exposition. p.
30.

Sence

Sence in his Letters to the Pope, from the Pope's Testimonial, that his Letter shewed his submission and respect to the Apostolick See.

As for the Pope's personal Infallibility, our Author in his Reflections (p. 8.) denies it to be an Article of Faith, because it is not positively determined by any General Council; in my Reply (p. 47.) I told him this is no proof, that it is not an Article of Faith, because the Infallibility of the Church itself, which they all grant to be an Article of Faith, was never positively determined by any General Council; and therefore some Doctrines may be Articles of Faith, which never were determined by any General Council; and I added, that if the Church be infallible, the Pope must, if he be the Head of the Church; for infallibility ought in reason to accompany the greatest and most absolute Power: But our Author thought fit to let fall this Dispute, and to resolve all into the Bishop of Condom's Authority.

His Proposal which follows, I have already answered without a smile, but I cannot forbear smiling once more to hear him complain of Disputing; which he says, *Belongs not to the Representer*, Page 30. *who being to represent and not to dispute, is not concerned with those tedious Arguments.* The Case is this; In the Character of a Papist Represented, he had denied the Deposing Power to be an Article of Faith; the Answerer proved it was an Article of Faith, because it was decreed by General Councils; to this, in his Reflections he answers, that every thing approved in General Councils, is not an Article of Faith, but only Doctrinal Points, and those decreed with an *Anathema*; and therefore the Deposing Power not being declared as a Doctrinal Point, and the Decrees relating only to Discipline and Government, and not being decreed neither with an *Anathema*, it does not appear to be an Article of Faith. In Answer to this, in my Reply (p. 49.) I proposed three Enquiries, 1. *Whether nothing be an Article of Faith, but what is decreed with an Anathema?* 2. *Whether the Deposing Decree be a Doctrinal Point, or only matter of Discipline and Government?* 3. *What Authority General Councils have in decretis morum, or such matters as concern Discipline and Government?* This is the disputing he complains of, and I confess he has some reason for it; for Arguments that cannot be answered, how short soever they are, are very tedious; but how I could answer his Argument

without disputing, or how he comes to be unconcerned to defend his own Arguments, I cannot tell ; but tho' disputing is not his Province, *yet in Civility he will go out of his way with me*, and in Civility I will keep him company.

1. He confesses, *I prove at large that all Definitions of Faith declared in General Councils are not concluded with Anathema's, and in this he willingly agrees with me. But this does not at all prove, that whatsoever is declared in such a Council without an Anathema, is an Article of Faith ; and therefore nothing against us deserving any farther answer.* And thus he has very prettily altered the state of the Question ; he said the Deposing Doctrine tho' approved by General Councils, was not an Article of Faith, because not decreed with an *Anathema*. Now if this Argument be good, then nothing must be accounted an Article of Faith, but what is decreed with an *Anathema*. In opposition to which I proved that several Doctrines which they themselves account Articles of Faith, have been decreed by General Councils without *Anathema's* ; and he grants that I have proved this, and if I have, I am sure his Argument is lost, for then the Deposing Doctrine may be an Article of Faith, tho' it be not confirmed with an *Anathema*. And now instead of proving, that no Doctrine is an Article of Faith which is not decreed with an *Anathema*, he complains that I have not proved that every Doctrine which is decreed without an *Anathema*, is an Article of Faith, which is nothing at all to the purpose. We knew not where to find the Articles of the *Romish* Faith, but in the decrees of their Councils, and finding the Pope's power to depose Heretical Princes there, we took it for an Article of their Faith. No, says the Reflector, that is a mistake, it is no Article of Faith, because it is not decreed with an *Anathema*. We examine the matter, and find it otherwise, that Articles of Faith are decreed without *Anathema's*. Yes, says the Protester, this may be, but you must prove still that every Doctrine which is decreed *without an Anathema* is an Article of Faith ; which is a very easie matter to do after this ; for if being decreed with or without an *Anathema*, make no distinction as to this matter, then the Decree it self in doctrinal points must make an Article of Faith ; if some Doctrines which are acknowledged to be Articles of the *Romish* Faith are decreed without *Anathema's*, then it is no Argument against

against any Doctrine, being an Article of Faith, that it has no *Anathema* annexed to it ; so that our Author is wonderful uncertain what to call an Article of Faith ; if we call the Decrees of their Councils Articles of their Faith. No, says he, every Decree is not an Article of Faith, but only what is decreed with an *Anathema* ; if we confute this distinction, and prove that Articles of Faith are decreed without *Anathema's*, then he can distinguish no further ; but requires us to prove, that every Doctrine decreed without an *Anathema* is an Article of Faith, that is, that the Decree of their Church makes an Article of their Faith : and if that don't, I would desire to know of him, what does. And had I not reason then to say, *That it is wonderful hard to know what their Faith is*, when he himself cannot tell what it is that makes an Article of Faith, and their most Learned Divines so much differ about this matter ; some allowing that to be an Article of Faith, which others reject.

2^{ly}, The Second enquiry was, Whether the Deposing Decree be a Doctrinal point, or only matter of Discipline and Government : and in answer to this I told him, *That a Decree what shall be done, includes a virtual Definition of that Doctrine on which that Decree is founded.* To this he opposes what I say under the next head, *That in the Council of the Apostles at Jerusalem, there was a Decree of Manners, yet it contained no Definition of Doctrine.* Not expressly indeed, but virtually it does, as I said before. My business there, was to vindicate the Authority of Councils in those Decrees which relate to Manners, as not less Obligatory than the Decrees of Faith ; and I observed that the only Apostolical Council we have an account of in Scripture, viz. the Council at Jerusalem, Acts 15. was of this nature ; for the only Decrees made in it, were to abstain from Meats offered to Idols, and from Blood, and from things Strangled, and from Fornication ; and I observed, they might as well object here, (to invalidate this Decree) as they do against the Deposing Decree, that there is no point of Doctrine determined in it. And how does this contradict what I before asserted ? *That a Decree what shall be done, includes a virtual Definition of that Doctrine on which that Decree is founded.*

But however he says, *This Decree of what was to be done, did not include a virtual Definition of that Doctrine on which the Decree*

decree.

creed was founded ; for if it had, then the Doctrine of *Abstaining from Blood and Strangled Meats*, had been an Article of Faith. But what does he think of *abstaining from Fornication, and from Meats offered to Idols*, which are contained in the same Decree ? Is not that a necessary Doctrine, and virtually contained in that Decree ? I never said, That every Decree of Manners must be immediately founded on an Article of Faith : but I said, every Decree of Manners is founded on some Doctrine, (whether it be in a strict sense an Article of Faith, or not) and includes a virtual Definition of that Doctrine. The Decree to abstain from Fornication includes this Doctrine, that Fornication is unlawful under the Gospel ; and the Decree for Gentile Converts to abstain from Meats offered to Idols, supposes the same ; and the Decree to *abstain from Blood, and from things Strangled*, includes this Doctrinal Definition, That it was unlawful for *Gentile Christians* at that time to use their Christian Liberty in those matters, to the offence and scandal of believing *Jews*. The matter in short is this : Every Decree which commands the doing any thing, must contain a virtual Definition that such a thing may be lawfully done : and every Decree which forbids the doing any thing, does withal define, that such a thing is either absolutely unlawful in itself, or highly inexpedient, and therefore unlawful in such Circumstances to be done : this is as necessary as it is to command nothing but what is lawful, and to forbid nothing but what is either unlawful, or highly inexpedient. And therefore when the Church of *Rome* Decrees the Deposing Heretical Princes, or the Favourers of Hereticks : She virtually defines, that it is lawful to Depose Princes, which is a Doctrinal Definition, and may in a large sense be called an Article of Faith, as that signifies all Doctrinal Points proposed to us to be believed, as I observed in my Reply (p. 50).

3. The third Enquiry was, Whether the Authority of the Church be not as Sacred in Decrees of Manners, as in Articles of Faith ? for the proof of which, I urged the Council at *Jerusalem*, and shew'd, *That Rules of Discipline and Government to direct the lives and manners of men, is the only proper subject of Ecclesiastical Authority*, p. 55. And here where he should have taken notice of the Council of *Jerusalem*, he says nothing of it, but only says, (p. 32.) that I urge out of *Canus and Bellarmine*, that

General

General Councils cannot err even in such Decrees, when they relate to things necessary to Salvation, and which concern the whole Church. And when I have proved the Deposing Decree to be of this nature, and esteemed as such by their Church, I may then deserve a farther Consideration. What their Church will esteem, if he may be the Expounder of it, is nothing to the purpose, for we argue not from their private esteeming, but from their publick Definitions; and if a General Decree for the Government of the whole Church, concern the whole Church, and if to command a Sin concerns Men's Salvation, then the Deposing Decree does; for if it be unlawful to depose Heretical Princes, it is more than a single Sin to do it: and if they will grant, that General Councils cannot command a Sin, then they must grant, that it is lawful to depose Heretical Princes: and I agree with him, that this does deserve a further Consideration, and shall be glad to hear his thoughts of it.

This Author in his Reflections (p. 10.) proves that Popes themselves own, that the Deposing Power is no Article of Faith, in letting so many open and positive Asserters of the No-Deposing Power pass without any Censure of Heresy. This in my Reply (p. 57.) I attribute to their want of Power. For Princes will not be deposed now, nor suffer those to be censured who deny the Deposing Power. This in his Protestation (p. 32.) he says, Is spoke like an Oracle; but he expects some better Argument than my bare assurance of what the Pope would do if he had Power. And I thought I had given him a better Argument than my bare word for it, viz. the experience of former Ages, what Popes did when they had Power: for tho' the Infallible Chair may dissemble a little, when circumstances of Affairs require it, yet sure it is not given to change.

What follows about the Worship of Saints and Images, I suppose has been sufficiently answered already, but I cannot but observe a very pleasant Argument he has against what I assert, That no intention can alter the nature of actions, which are determined by a Divine or Humane Law. Whereby I prove, that if they do such things, as in the account of the Divine Law are Idolatrous, their intention not to commit Idolatry will not excuse them, This he says (p. 36.) a Quaker might as reasonably make use of for the justifying his Tea's and his Nay's, and his other points of Quakerism. For if he should say, No intention can alter the nature of actions, which are determined by a divine or humane Law, but swear

not at all, neither be ye called Masters; and let your communication be yea, yea, nay, nay, are actions or things determined by the divine law, therefore the intention of doing no evil in them, cannot excuse the doing otherwise than is there determined, from the guilt of sin. But will our Protester say, that the Divine Law does forbid all Swearing? then I grant that the Quakers are in the right, and no intention will justify Swearing; but St. James must be expounded so as to reconcile his words with other passages in Scripture, which allow of Swearing; and could he shew us where bowing, and kissing, and kneeling, and praying before an Image is in any sense allow'd in Scripture, then we would grant also, that the direction of the intention would justify such a use of their actions, as the Scripture allows: but what is absolutely forbid to be done, no intention can excuse, which is our present case here. He concludes all with two or three Requests, which must be briefly confide'd.

Page 37.

1. *That he (the Replier) will use his interest with Protestants, to hold to what he says they do, and charge us with nothing but what we expressly profess to believe and practice.* Now I can assure him there is no need of using my interest with Protestants to do this, for I hope they are naturally inclined to be honest: but there are so many *Us's* among them, that possibly some Protestants may mistake one *Us* for another. They practice indeed generally much alike, but they believe differently, and they represent differently, and they expound the Doctrine of their Councils differently; and I hope Protestants may without any offence say how and wherein they differ, and I think we cannot be justly charged with Misrepresenting, while we relate matter of Fact truly, what their Practice is, and what their different Sentiments and Opinions are about these matters.

2. *That they (Protestants) pick not up the Abuses of some, the Vices and Cruelties of others, the odd Opinions of particular Authors, and hold these forth for the Doctrines and Practices of our Church; and that in charging any Practices, they charge no more than are concerned.* Now this is very reasonable, if he speaks of such Abuses as are not allowed and countenanced by the Church; and of such Cruelties as are not practised, encouraged, commended by the Governours of the Church, and justified by the Decrees and Canons of Popes and Councils; or of such

odd

odd Opinions of particular Authors, as steal into the World without Publick Authority, and are censured as soon as they are known; but as far as the Church gives any Countenance and Authority to such *Abuses, Cruelties, odd Opinions*, I see no reason why Protestants may not complain of these things, and charge the Church of *Rome* with them, and not like that Church ever the better, which suffers such Abuses, and applauds such Cruelties, as *Papists themselves*, who have not put off all humanity cannot but abhor.

3. *That as often as they tell, what they think of our Doctrines and Practices, they would likewise at the same time inform their Hearers, that those thoughts are, as the Replier says, Opinions, Interpretations, and Consequences of their own concerning our Doctrine, and not our avowed Doctrine.* But this is a very needless Caution, as I observed before; for our People do not think, that the *Papists* themselves believe all that ill of their own Doctrines and Practices which we charge them with; and I cannot easily see, how our disputing against the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, and answering the Arguments whereby they justify themselves, should betray People into such a mistake; for it is no natural proof, that two men are of the same mind because they dispute against one another.

Thus much for the Protester. And to conclude the whole, I shall give my Readers a short view of the whole Progress of this Dispute, that they may see what shuffling Adversaries we have to deal with.

When the Book, entituled, *A Papist Misrepresented and Represented*, was exposed to publick view, and mightily applauded by those of the *Roman* Communion, and industriously dispersed, and earnestly recommended to the perusal of *Protestants*, a very learned and charitable hand undertook to make a true Representation of the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*, which he performed with such full and plain evidence, that the *Misrepresenter* hath not so much as attempted to charge him with any one false Citation, nor to shew in any one particular, that he has Misrepresented their Doctrines and Practices; but instead of this, in his Reflections on the Answer (if the Re-

flecter and Misrepresenter be the same person, as he owns himself to be) he makes fresh complaints of *Protestant* Mirepresenting *Papists*; which if it had been true, is no confutation of that Representation which the Answerer had made of *Popery*; The Question then was, Whether the Church of *Rome* believes and practises, as the Answerer says she does, and proves by unquestionable Authorities that she does. But this was too plainly proved, to be a Question any longer, and therefore he rather chose to debate that general Question about the Rules of Representing, and how we must know what is the Faith of the Church of *Rome*, and whether the Bishop of *Condom's* Exposition have not a sufficient Authority given to it by the Pope and Cardinals, and Bishops of *France*, and what the Authority of private Doctors is, and the like; but has not in any one particular shewn wherein the Answerer has Misrepresented them, that the Authorities he alledges are not good, that he has put any forced and unnatural sense upon the words of their Council, or Catechism, or Doctors, or that their Church has by any publick Acts contradicted what he charges to be her Doctrine or Practice. This he has not done; and therefore we have reason to believe this he could not do; and this is reason enough to conclude, that the Answer contains a true Representation of the Doctrines and Practices of the Church of *Rome*.

I did not think such Reflections as these worth the notice of the Learned Answerer, and therefore undertook to reply to them myself, and particularly examined every thing he had said; in return to this, he publishes another Answer, which he calls *Papists* *Protesting against Protestant Popery*; and I thought it would come to bare *Protesting* at last, for his Reason and Argument run very low before; this I have now considered, and I think have not suffered any thing to escape without an answer; but that the Reader may the better understand what a formidable Adversary this is, I shall briefly compare the Reply with his Answer, and then leave him to judge of the ingenuity and honesty of the Protefter.

In answer to his fresh complaint of Misrepresenting, in my Reply I considered what it is to Misrepresent, *viz.* To charge them

them with such Doctrines and Practices as the Church of *Rome* disowns; and proved from his own Character of a *Papist* Misrepresented, that we are no Misrepresenters; for what he makes us charge them with believing and doing, in the *Character of a Papist Misrepresented*, that he owns and defends in the *Character of a Papist Represented*; and the only difference in most Cases between these two Characters is this, That in the *Character of a Papist Misrepresented* he puts in all the ill things which *Protestants* say of their Faith and Worship, and in the *Character of a Papist Represented* he says all the good things he can of it; but this I told him does not belong to Representation, but Dispute, and therefore whatever guilt we charge their Doctrines and Practices with, this is not to Misrepresent, while we charge them with nothing but what is their Faith and Practice; to Represent in this sense is only to report matter of Fact; and he who reports truly, cannot Misrepresent. If we charge them with any guilt, which they think they are not chargeable with, this becomes matter of Dispute; and it is not enough to confute such a charge, to tell the World, that they do not believe so ill of their own Doctrines and Practices as we *Protestants* do. By this Rule I examined the Thirty Seven particulars of his *Character*, and carefully distinguished between matters of Representation and Dispute, and all this he grants, and yet in his Answer falls a protesting against *Protestant Popery*, as if we had made a new Religion for them; whereas we only tell them what the faults of their Religion is; and this he calls *Protestant Popery*, That is, the judgment of *Protestants* concerning *Popery*; and this he *Protests* against, which is a much easier way than to confute it.

And now instead of defending his own Characters, wherein he had charged us with Misrepresenting *Papists*, and which I had proved, and he in effect granted to be no Misrepresentation: he seeks about to find out some new *Protestant* Misrepresenters, and fills up several Pages with Citations out of the Manual of *John* Archbishop of *York*, Mr. *Sutcliff*, and others. Now in the first place he ought to have shewn, that the distinction between matters of Representation and Dispute, by which I answer'd his own Characters, will not justify these

Misrepresenters also, as most certainly it will, and a hundred more if he can find them; but he says not one word of this, but only cites their words, and calls it Misrepresenting. But besides this, he has used very foul play to make Misrepresenters of them: The Archbishop only transcribes out of Popish Authors, and cites his Authorities; the Protester sets all down as the Archbishop's words, without letting his Reader know that *Papists* teach these things, and that the Archbishop only repeats them after them. But besides concealing the Popish Authorities to which they refer, he has taken another course with Mr. *Sutcliffe*, has set down only half Sentences, and concealed both the Authorities and the Reasons he alleges for what he says, which is in a strict and proper sense to Misrepresent. All that he answers to that distinction between representing and disputing, which he allows to be good, is this, That the common people do not distinguish these matters, but look upon all to be equally the Faith of *Papists*; that is, if they hear any man call the Worship of Images Idolatry, they do as verily think that *Papists* believe Idolatry lawful (as he says in his *Character*) as that they worship Images, *visum teneatis!* and thus much for Representing.

The next Dispute is about the Rule of Representing. In his Introduction to *A Papist Misrepresented*, &c. he appeals to the Council of *Trent*, and *Catechism ad Parochos*; this the Answerer likes well, but tells him, 1. That he shews no Authority he hath to interpret that Rule in his own sense, against the Doctrine of many others as zealous for their Church as himself, as he does in the Pope's Personal Infallibility, and the Deposing Power, which he says, are no Articles of Faith, though other zealous *Papists* say they are, and asks what Authority he has to declare the sense of the Council of *Trent*, when the Pope has expressly forbidden all Prelates to do it, and reserved it to the Apostolical See. 2. The Answerer tells him, That he leaves out, in the several particulars, an essential part of the Character of a *Papist* since the Council of *Trent*, which is, that he doth not only believe the Doctrine there defined, to be true, but to be necessary to Salvation. 3. That he never sets down what it is, which makes any Doctrine to become a Doctrine of their Church. 4. That he makes use of the Authority of particular Divines, as delivering the sense of their

Doctrines and Practices of the Church of Rome truly Represented, p. 6. Ed. 2.

Bulla Pii quarti super confirmatione Concilii Tridentini.

their Church, when there are so many of greater Authority against them: whereas, if we proceed by his own Rule, the greater number is to carry it. These were all very material Objections, and did deserve to be considered; but as for the three last; he takes no notice of them in his Reflections, and says very little to the first.

The Answerer had asked, *How the Council of Trent comes to be the Rule and Measure of Doctrine to any here (in England) where it was never received?* (p. 4.) To this he answers in his Reflections, (p. 5.) *That the Council of Trent is received here, and all the Catholick World, as to all its Definitions of Faith.* But I told him in my Reply, (p. 51.) that the meaning of that Question was not, *Whether it was owned by private Catholics, but by what publick Act of Church or State it had been received in England, as it had been in other Catholick Countries;* and this he says nothing to, and therefore might as well have let it alone at first.

I reinforced the Bull of Pope Pius 4th, against any private Man's interpreting the Council according to his own private Sense; shewed the Reason and Policy of it, and what a presumption it is for a private Man, when their Divines differ in their Opinions about any Doctrine, to call one Opinion Popery Represented, and the other Popery Misrepresented, as our Author has done in the Articles of the Pope's personal Infallibility, and the Deposing Power, as if *Bellarmin* and *Suarez* must not pass for good Catholics, but for Misrepresenters, because they do not believe in these Points, as our Representer does? and this he takes no further notice of.

But to prove that he has not interpreted the Council according to his own private Sense, he appeals to the Bishop of *Condom's* Exposition, which is approved by the Pope himself, and therefore *has the Authority of the See Apostolick.* To this I answered, that *Bellarmin's* Controversies had as great an Attestation from Pope *Sixtus* 5. as the Bishop of *Condom's* from this present Pope; to which he gives no Answer; and I observed from *Canus*, that the Pope's private Approbation is not the Authority of the See Apostolick, but only his Judgment, *ex Cathedra*; and to this he gives no answer, but shuffles a little about

Papists Prot.
p. 25.

a private, malicious, and inconsiderate Judgment, which I have now answered, and makes a new Flourish about the several Translations, and great approbation which has been given to this Exposition, which I have again said something to, tho' I need not have said any thing, had I before seen the Preface to the Answer to the Bishop of Condom, and I guess our Author will never mention it more, and then what becomes of his Characters.

Reflect. p. 8.

He denied the *Pope's Personal Infallibility to be an Article of Faith because not positively determined by any General Council.* In answer to which I told him, that other Roman Divines did believe it an Article of Faith. That the Churches Infallibility was not determined by any General Council, no more than the Pope's Infallibility, and yet was owned by them as an Article of Faith; that if there be any Infallibility in the Church, the Pope as the Supreme Pastor, has the fairest pretence to it. For Infallibility ought in reason to accompany the greatest and most absolute Power; and this he has passed over silently.

Refl. p. 8, 9.

Next comes the *Deposing Power*, which has as evidently been declared in General Councils, as Transubstantiation; and how comes this to be no Article of Faith? To this he answers, that it wants an *Anathema*, and that it is not decreed as a Doctrinal point, but as a matter of Discipline and Government.

Rep. p. 49, &c.

This I examined at large in my Reply, and he is much concerned at it, that I put him out of his Representing Humour by disputing; but he thought himself bound in Civility to say something to it, and truly he has been wonderfully Civil, as appears from what I have already said in Answer to him.

Refl. p. 15, 16.

The Answerer in his Introduction had proved the *Deposing Doctrine* on him, from two Sayings of his own, *That the Orders of the Supreme Pastor are to be obeyed whether Infallible or not: and, That Popes have own'd the Deposing Doctrine, and acted according to it:* and others are bound to obey their Orders, and consequently to act when Popes shall require it, according to the *Deposing Doctrine*: To this he answers in his Reflections, that he only made a comparison between Civil and Ecclesiastical Power, and therefore it is as unjust from hence to infer, That all the

the Orders of the Pope must be obey'd, as it would be to say, that Subjects must obey their Princes in every thing they command, whether it be good or bad : and this I told him in my Reply, *I would acknowledge to be a good Answer, if he would grant the Deposing Doctrine to be a Sin.* But this I suppose he was unwilling to do, and therefore we hear no more of this matter. Reply, p. 55.

In the next place in his Reflections he finds great fault with the Answerers way of proceeding, which I reduced to four Heads, 1. *That the Answerer in some points owns the Doctrine* Ibid. p. 58. (which he has Represented to be the Faith of a Roman-Catholick) to be the established Belief of the Church of England. This I proved not to be true, by a particular Examination of those Instances he gave. 2. He charges the Answerer with appealing from Pag. 61. the Definitions of their Councils, and Sence of their Church, to some Expressions found in old Mass-Books, Rituals, &c. This I shewed also, that the Answerer has not done.

3. *That he appeals from the Declarations of their Councils, and Sence of their Church, to some external Action, as in case of Respect shewn to Images and Saints, upon which from our external Adoration you are willing to conclude us guilty of Idolatry.* Whereas he thinks we must not judge of these Actions without respect to the Pag. 63. Intention of the Church who commands them, and of the person who does them. 4. *That he appeals from their Councils and Sence of their Church, to the Sentiments of their private Authors.* These Objections I answered at large in my Reply, but he has returned Pag. 67. not one word to any of them, excepting the third, and how he has Answered that, you have already heard.

This is the new way of answering Books *A la-mode* of Rome ; but the greatest Wits can do no more than the Cause will bear, tho' a little prudence would teach men to say nothing in such a Cause as will admit of no better a Defence.

F I N I S.

(21)

[illegible]

[Circular stamp: JUN 1967]

...and how to use the word in the right way.

1. The first part of the document is a letter from the President of the United States to the Congress, dated January 1, 1861. It is a copy of the original letter, and is signed by Abraham Lincoln.



2141

INDEPENDENT

1936

OF THE